THE IDEA OF RACIALISM

Its Meaning and History

LOUIS L. SNYDER

Professor of History

The City University of New York

AN ANVIL ORIGINAL

under the general editorship of

LOUIS L. SNYDER

D. VAN NOSTRAND COMPANY, INC.

PRINCETON, NEW JERSEY

TORONTO LONDON

MELBOURNE



TO
IDA MAE SNYDER
Co-editor and co-worker on the Anvil series
since its inception

VAN NOSTRAND REGIONAL OFFICES:
New York, Chicago, San Francisco

D. VAN NOSTRAND COMPANY, LTD., *London*

D. VAN NOSTRAND COMPANY, (Canada), LTD., *Toronto*

D. VAN NOSTRAND AUSTRALIA PTY. LTD., *Melbourne*

Published simultaneously in Canada by
D. VAN NOSTRAND COMPANY (Canada), LTD.

PRINTED IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

PREFACE

John Stuart Mill said it plainly: "Of all the vulgar modes of escaping from the consideration of the effects of social and moral influences on the human mind, the most vulgar is that of attributing the diversities of conduct and character to inherent natural differences." Mill was speaking of what has since become one of the most important movements of modern times. Racialism is at once a creed and an emotional attitude, a symptom of insecurity. It is anti-rational, in open contradiction to the humanist tradition of our civilization. Millions of people are conscious or unconscious racialists, obsessed with a doctrinal idea, a rationalization or justification for social prejudice.

There has been much scholarly and valuable research on race and its related fields. There is an even greater amount of illogical, irrational, and scientific fallacy concerned with this subject. An attempt is made in this Anvil book to give attention to both facets.

Answers are sought here to these questions: What is the meaning of the term "race" and its corollaries, "racism" and "racialism"? What is the relationship between race and history? How did the racial myths originate—Aryanism, Nordicism, Teutonism, Anglo-Saxonism, Celticism? What about such special problems as Jews and Negroes? What was the course of racialism in the United States? What is the dominant scientific thinking on race today?

While varying points of view are presented in concise form, a stand is taken against myth, inconsistency, and contradiction. The documents and readings have been selected to throw light on racialism by giving attention to widely accepted racial facts as well as to racial fallacies.

New York City
September 1, 1962 LOUIS L. SNYDER

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Part I The Idea of Racialism

Part II Readings

Part I

THE IDEA OF RACIALISM

— 1 —

THE MEANING OF RACIALISM

The Tyranny of Words. The addition of the suffix "-ism" to key words in our language often leads to confusion in communicating ideas. Amid the welter of vague political abstractions, the attempt to pin down the meaning of any "-ism" becomes most difficult. Meanings shift quickly when they are manipulated by propaganda for one purpose or another. In the social sciences we cannot expect the same rigor of definition as in the exact sciences. When we consider such terms as racialism (or nationalism, internationalism, imperialism, and colonialism), we are faced with absurdity, with distortion, with obscurantism. We are confronted with a most important idea, but one that is elusive and shifty.

Perhaps our best approach is to concentrate on "race" —the root word of this particular "-ism." We shall find varieties in meaning, inconsistencies, and contradictions. Race is more often than not used in a loose sense to indicate a national group (Frenchmen), a religious group (Jews), a cultural group (Europeans), a linguistic group (Aryans), even a geographical group (Icelanders). We shall see how use of this word to justify national or political ambitions has resulted in nebulosity and disorder.

What Is Race? The definition of race in Webster's Unabridged Dictionary shows how widely the word is used and how varied are the nuances it may suggest:

race, *n.* [F. *race,* fr. It. *razza,* of uncert. origin.] The descendants of a common ancestor; a family, tribe, people,

or nation, believed or presumed to belong to the same stock; a lineage; a breed; also, more broadly, a class or kind of individuals with common characteristics, interests, appearance, habits, or the like, as if derived from a common ancestor; as, the *race* of doctors; the *race* of birds.
The whole *race* of mankind. *Shakespeare*

Following this introductory section there are three more inches of explanatory definitions, all of which confuse the issue still further. The complicating factor is that race is used in a bewildering variety of meaning. Both Rudyard Kipling and Winston Churchill praised the virtues of the "British race." (There is a British *people*, but there is no British *race*.) Both Otto von Bismarck and Adolf Hitler spoke of the "German race." (There is no more a *German race* than an *American race*.) A most common phrase is the "Jewish race." (There is no more a Jewish race than a Catholic or Buddhist race.) Nazi scholars heaped glory on the so-called "Aryan race." (There is no more an Aryan race than an Aryan breed of elephants.)

On first thought, the concept of race seems to be simple enough. For example, a British office clerk, a Hong Kong coolie, and a Congolese policemen seem to be representative of three distinct races—white, yellow, and black. The popular notion is to accept without question the idea that each of these men represents a wholly distinct variant of the human species, different in physical as well as mental character. The immediate impression of bodily appearance sets each man apart from the others. But there are other factors which make the matter of race exceedingly complex.

There are two approaches to the semantic problem. In a literary sense, race has been used to apply to any human group, genetic or not. Thus, it serves a purpose in the language. The second usage is scientific, with an altered or at least restricted meaning. The word is thus used in both literary and scientific forms, with one group reading into the word meaning which the other group ignores. The confusion is compounded by changes in meaning from one language to another, as well as use of the term for nationalist or imperialist purposes.

Faced with this misunderstanding, Giorgio Pasquali, an Italian journalist, gave up altogether: "I prefer the word *nation* when I speak of human beings, and the word *races* when I speak of Pekinese, racing horses, chickens, and Yorkshire swine." Some scholars, too, suggest that the word race be rejected in common usage and that it be replaced by the term *ethnic groups*.

However, let us seek a working definition to help free the word race from false meanings. It primarily denotes a *biological category*. Outside the field of biology the word tends to become utterly meaningless. Even under the loosest definition, race implies the existence of groups which have certain similarities in somatic characteristics which are perpetuated according to laws of biological inheritance (with a margin of individual variation).

All peoples are aware of blood-relationship or biological kinship. The human race embodies the idea that all men living today are descended from common ancestors and are thus blood relatives. Within the great community of man there are smaller communities which are distinguished by certain biological differences (Europeans, Mongoloid peoples of Asia, aboriginals of Africa). Biologically, these peoples, in becoming adapted to their environment, develop a particular array of traits which come to characterize them.

In biology, then, the following definitions seem to be valid:

> A race is a group of related intermarrying individuals, a population, which differs from other populations in the relative commonness of certain hereditary traits.
>
> —L. C. Dunn

> By race we should understand the continuity of a physical type, expressing affinities of blood, representing an essentially natural grouping, which can have nothing, and in general has nothing in common with the people, the nationality, the languages, or the customs corresponding to groupings that are purely artificial, in no way anthropological, and arising entirely from history, whose actual products they are.
>
> —Marcellin Boule

Ernest Albert Hooton (1887-1954), a former head of the Department of Anthropology at Harvard University and a leading American physical anthropologist, presented these definitions from the viewpoint of the anthropologist:

> A race is a great division of mankind, the members of which, though individually varying, are characterized as a group by a certain combination of morphological and metrical features, principally non-adaptive, which have been derived from their common descent.

> A primary race is one which has been modified only by the operation of evolutionary factors, including the selection of its own intrinsic variations and of the modifications, adaptive or non-adaptive, possibly caused by environmental stimuli.

> A secondary or composite race is one in which a characteristic and stabilized combination of morphological and metrical features has been effected by a long-continued intermixture of two or more primary races within an area of relative isolation.

According to Victor Valerianovich Bunak (1891-), director of the Anthropological Institute at Moscow University, the term race, in zoological systematics, corresponds in meaning to the term subspecies. "A major race corresponds to species; a sub-race to a tribe; local race, to stock; physical race to a *morphe;* collective major race to a *species collectiva.*"

Race, Racism, and Racialism. From the root word race come two terms closely allied and often used interchangeably—racism and racialism. *Racism* assumes inherent racial superiority or the purity and superiority of certain races; also, it denotes any doctrine or progam of racial domination based on such an assumption. Less specifically, it refers to race hatred and discrimination. *Racialism* assumes similar ideas, but describes especially race hatred and racial prejudice.

The idea of racialism goes far beyond the biological sense of race. It utilizes the word pseudo-scientifically for specific political and economic purposes. It is, unfortunately, suffused with myth and fallacy.

Race Classification. Many attempts have been made to arrange the ethnic groups of mankind into some ordered classification. Because distinct lines of demarcation do not exist, any classification necessarily must be subjective and arbitrary.

The earliest classification of races was based on simple biological differences. In 1735, the Swedish pioneer botanist, Carl von Linnaeus (1707-1778), in his *Systema Naturae,* described the species of *Homo sapiens* as a fixed and unchangeable entity, and divided it into four varieties: American ("reddish, choleric, erect"); European ("white, ruddy, muscular"); Asiatic ("yellow, melancholic, inflexible"); and African ("black, phlegmatic, indulgent"). The chief distinction made by Linnaeus was color of skin, but to this he added temperament, customs, and habits. For many years this principal trait of skin color in classifying humans retained popularity.

In 1749, the French naturalist, George Louis Leclerc, Comte de Buffon (1708-1788), a contemporary of Linnaeus, distinguished six varieties, or "races": 1. Laplander, or Polar race; 2. Tatar or Mongolian race; 3. Southern Asiatic race; 4. European race; 5. Ethiopian race; 6. American race. (Buffon is generally given credit for introducing the word race into the language of natural science.) He regarded man as one species which has split into numerous varieties. (*See Reading No. 1.*) He used skin color, stature, and bodily figure, as well as certain "psychic traits," in differentiating the races. While his division was similar to that of Linnaeus, he objected to the latter's theory that the species is constant.

In 1775, Johann Friedrich Blumenbach (1752-1840), German physician, proposed the division of mankind into five races attached to five sections of the globe: Caucasian, Mongolian, Malay, Ethiopian, and American. (He thus originated the term Caucasian.) (*See Reading No. 2.*)

Throughout the nineteenth century there were continuing efforts at classification of races, with emphasis upon color, type of hair, form of nose, and shape of skull. The number of races projected varied from two or three to thirty-five. In 1860, Isidore Geoffroy Saint-Hilaire (1805-1861), French naturalist, proposed four principal and thirteen secondary races or types as shown in Table 1.

Table 1 *Saint-Hilaire's Classification of Races*

Principal Races	Secondary Races
(1) Caucasian	(1) Caucasian, (2) Alleghenian (Red Indian)
(2) Mongolian	(3) Hyperborean (Lapps), (4) Malay, (5) American (except the Red Indian) (6) Mongolian, (7) Paraborean (Eskimo), (8) Australian
(3) Ethiopian	(9) Kafir, (10) Ethiopian, (11) Negro, (12) Melanesian
(4) Hottentot	(13) Hottentot

In 1865, Thomas Henry Huxley, British physician, proposed eleven races, which in 1870 he changed to five principal and fourteen secondary races. (See Table 2.)

Table 2 *Huxley's Classification of Races*

Principal Races	Secondary Races or Modifications
(1) Negroid	(1) Bushman, (2) Negro, (3) Papuan
(2) Australoid	(4) Australians, (5) Black race of Deccan (Dravidians), (6) Ethiopian (Hamite)
(3) Mongoloid	(7) Mongol, (8) Polynesian, (9) American, (10) Eskimo, (11) Malay
(4) Xanthochroid	(12) Xanthochroid of Northern Europe
(5) Melanochroid	(13) Melanochroid of Southern Europe (14) Melanochroid of Asia (Arabs, Afghans, Hindus, etc.)

In 1878, Paul Topinard (1830-1911), French physician, enumerated sixteen races, which he increased in 1885 to nineteen. In 1873, Ernst Haeckel (1834-1919), Prussian protozoologist, divided the races into twelve, and increased them in 1879 to thirty-four. In 1899, William Zebina Ripley (1867-1941), Harvard sociologist, presented the doctrine that the population of Europe consisted of three races (Teutonic, Celtic, and Mediterranean) living together. (*See Reading No. 3.*) In 1900, Joseph Deniker (1852-1918), Russian ethnologist and raciologist, proposed an opposing synthesis, consisting of six primary races and twenty-nine sub-races. (*See Reading No. 4.*) In 1911, Giuseppe Sergi (1841-1936), Italian psychologist, using a scheme of classifying cranial

shapes descriptively, divided mankind into long-heads and round-heads—Eurafricans and Eurasiatics.

Virtually every scholar in the field has suggested and recommended use of his own classification. Georges Crétien Dagobert Cuvier (1769-1832), Swiss founder of paleontology, proposed a tripartite division of mankind based on the three sons of Noah—Ham, Shem, and Japheth, a scheme that was demolished by the biological researches of Darwin.

The urge toward classification has been as intense as it is bewildering. In most attempts the divisions were based on anatomical characteristics. Some scholars, dissatisfied with a purely biological approach, sought classification by *geographical* method—observing populations in given areas and searching for common characteristics. Others turned to the *historical* method—studying the migration of ethnic groups. Still others used the *cultural* method—seeking to ascertain racial mentality from cultural conditions. Examples of this latter approach are Carus's division into four races: European, African, Mongoloid, and American, based on "day, night, Eastern dawn, and Western dawn"; and Klemm's division into active (male) and passive (female) races, a division later accepted and elaborated by Gobineau.

All these classification methods present difficulties not easy to solve. Anatomical, linguistic, mental, and cultural traits are so deeply intertwined that it is hard to make any meaningful distinctions between the races. Today, many scholars feel that non-biological attributes, such as geography, language, and cultural traits, are useless in aiding the definition or classification of races.

Methods of Classification. Two major methods have been employed in classifying the races. One is based on study of the skull. The second, and more widely used, is based on such characteristics as skin color, stature, hair, and form of eyes, nose, and face. Recent research has combined both methods, adding to them such indications as experimentation in agglutinative reactions of the red blood corpuscles,[1] body temperature, respiration, suscepti-

[1] Thus far, anthropological investigations on the blood groups have yielded little evidence for race differences. According to the physician and serologist, Alexander Solomon Wiener (1907-), by means of serological tests, the proteins and cells of animals of any species can be

bility to disease, basal metabolism, time and effect of puberty and menopause, color vision, reaction of the endocrine glands, constitutional types, brain size and structure, mental types, speed of nerve condition, nature of the sense of smell, and body odors. How to integrate all these concepts has become a perplexing scientific problem. Our knowledge is only beginning in this field. Actually, we know very little about the causes of differences of skin color, shape of nose, or quality of hair. In some cases a physical characteristic might represent an adaptation to climate, in others it might not. We do know this: that when populations are isolated from one another, they tend to develop differences; when peoples mix, the differences between them tend to diminish.

The Cephalic Index. With the development of anthropology as a science in the nineteenth century came the introduction of quantitative methods of distinguishing between ethnic groups. The first step was the introduction in 1842 of the cephalic index by the Swedish comparative anatomist, Anders Adolf Retzius (1796-1860). Retzius based his work on earlier studies by which arithmetical methods were applied to biological phenomena (Quételet) and studies of angles (Daubenton and Camper). (*See Reading No. 5.*)

The cephalic index expresses the percentage ratio of the length to the breadth of the skull. The longer diameter of a skull, the antero-posterior diameter, is taken as 100. Assuming the length as 100, the proportion of the breadth seldom falls below 70 or over 90. Thus followed the description of the indices:

1. *Dolichocephalic:* long- or narrow-headed, with a C.I. (cephalic index) below 75.
2. *Mesocephalic,* or *mesaticephalic:* the medium-headed group, with a C.I. ranging between 80 and 75.

---

differentiated, as a rule, from animals belonging to another species. "On the other hand, attempts to produce sera which would serve to differentiate blood of different races particularly in the human species have been unsuccessful. Agglutinogens of human blood so far discovered are not restricted to any race, and consequently the presence or absence of any of the agglutinogens in a given blood specimen cannot be used as evidence that the blood came from an individual of a given race."

3. *Brachycephalic:* short-headed, or broad-skulled group, with a C.I. of 80 or above.

Use of the cephalic index became popular in the late nineteenth century. Anthropologists looking for some convenient standard of race classification were attracted by the relative ease with which head-forms could be measured. Some believed that shape of skull was that physical feature most resistant to environment. Eventually, quantitative and statistical treatment of series of skulls was passionately pursued by racialists, especially those who were certain that the dolichocephalic skull indicated a superior race.

Taken by itself, the cephalic index was by no means a sure guide to race. There are dolichocephalic, mesocephalic, and brachycephalic skulls in all the great divisions of mankind. L. H. Dudley Buxton pointed out that a series of 6,000 Japanese contained one man with an index of 69 and one of 96, and, in a continuous series between these two extremes, more than 700 (some 12%) had indices between 80 and 81, the average being just under the latter figure. If the people of a certain area appear to fall within any one of the three major classifications of white, yellow, and black, the variation within that group will in all probability be so great as to make classification by head form of no value at all.

Use of the cephalic index requires careful recording of averages. Yet both Roland B. Dixon, Harvard University culture-anthropologist, and Eugène Pittard were skeptical about the use of averages. Pittard warned that it was wrong to use averages where the mean alone is given without at least showing the extremes in which it is contained. Dixon put it this way: "If the actual combinations of head, face, nose, orbit, and palate forms in the individual skulls are examined, hardly a single skull will show the association of characters stated on the basis of averages to be typical of the group. . . . All such contrasts are blurred or concealed when the measurements are averaged, and so the series of crania may in reality be in no sense uniform, but made up of several clear-cut and radically different groups, each marked by its own specific combination of characters."

Despite the meager results of cephalic index research, it would be unrealistic to reject the whole idea of anthro-

pometry as worthless. However, the problem presented by the geographical distribution of head forms, especially the cephalic index, has not yet been solved.

Skin Color. The oldest grouping of mankind, and the one still in popular use, is that of skin color. Even the Egyptians of antiquity distinguished themselves from other peoples by the color of their skin. Differences in color are due to the frequency of various granules in the deeper layer of the epidermis. Anthropologists believe that degrees in pigmentation are due to the effects of environment, possibly to sunlight or to humidity or to a combination of both. But there has been little success in measuring accurately the effects of heat, humidity, altitude, and food on skin pigmentation. True, the darkest skins are to be found in the tropics, and the fairest in the temperate climate of Western Europe. But attempts to correlate color and environment tend to break down when specific cases are considered.

In the popular mind there are three distinct races according to skin color: white-skinned (*leucodermi*); yellow-skinned (*xanthodermi*); and black-skinned (*melanodermi*). This is a convenient framework, but, actually, variations within each group make it hard to ascertain sharp, clear-cut differentiations. There are few really black men among Negroes, Australians, or Melanesians. The anthropologist A. L. Kroeber (1876-) spoke of millions of Caucasians who are darker in complexion than millions of Mongolians. Other anthropologists point out that in the United States thousands of so-called blacks pass unnoticed into the white grouping each year. Generalizations correlating color with geography tend to break down where particular areas are concerned. It is fair to conclude, then, that the use of skin color alone in classifying races results in confusion, unless its average value is correlated with other criteria.

Stature. Quite as inconclusive in determining race is stature. The average stature of man is within a range of a foot and a half, from four feet four inches to five feet ten inches, but within these limits there are wide variations. Ripley found these variations to be caused by environment acting directly through limitation of the food supply, natural or artificial selection, habits of life, and "sportiveness of Nature," or chance. In a classic study

Franz Boas (1858-1942), Columbia University anthropologist, found that a people could be dwarfed by unfortunate conditions of life, as for example the Jews of the Polish ghetto. But the children of these Jews, Boas found, gained stature in the favorable environment of the United States. (*See Reading No. 6.*) Boas warned that stature, as well as cephalic index, could be considered as a fundamental racial criterion in exceptional cases only. Stature may persist as an ethnic trait, he suggested, but no satisfactory conclusions have been drawn thus far as to its value in determining differences between groups.

Hair Form. On the basis of hair form, mankind may be divided into (1) straight-haired (*leiotrichous*), American and Asiatic aborigines; (2) woolly-haired (*ulotrichous*), Hottentots and Bushmen; and (3) wavy- or curly-haired (*cymotrichous*), the intermediate group, Western Europeans particularly. These are commonly accepted divisions. Yet every variety may be found in any one area. Certain hair characteristics may persist through generations of intermixture, but no absolute classification of races is possible on the basis of either the nature of the hair or its cross-sections. Even the correlation with environment breaks down because of widespread racial intermixture.

Facial Characteristics. Other attempts to distinguish between the races have been made by comparing differences in eye, nose, and facial structure. For example, it is commonly said that a sure distinction between the yellow and white races may be found in the so-called Mongolian eye-lid. In Europeans the slit, or opening of the eye is horizontal or full, while in Asiatics it is almond-shaped, oblique, or slant-eyed. There are also differences of pigmentation in the eyes believed to be connected in some way with climatic conditions.

The nasal index (N.I.) used by anthropologists is formed by taking the length of the nose from the root to the junction with the upper lip as 100 and expressing the breadth across the nostrils as a percentage. When the wings are broad (*platyrrhine*), the nasal index is over 85. When they are moderate (*mesorrhine*), the N.I. is 85 to 70. When narrow (*leptorrhine*), the N.I. is 70 or less. One classification holds that, in general, white-skinned peoples have a nasal index of less than 70, yellow-skinned

people 70 to 85, and black-skinned people above 85. It is also said that the nasal index tends to be high in countries where the air is moist and hot, and low in areas where it is cold and dry. Here, again, there are too many exceptions to the rule.

Another approach concentrates on shape of the face. Narrow-headed peoples, it is said, possess narrow faces (*leptyprosopy*), while broad-headed persons have broad faces (*chamaeprosopy*). But where can we place those Eskimos who have long heads and broad faces?

Unending Search for Classification. It is clear that no one somatic characteristic is sufficient to demonstrate demarcation lines between races. Study of physical criteria has not given us the basis for a fool-proof method of classifying the races. In most cases no invariable association of traits occurs. "Let us beware," said Ripley, "of the example of the monkey in the fable. Seeking to withdraw a huge handful of racial nuts from the jar of fact, we may find the neck of scientific possibility too small."

— 2 —

THE MYTHS OF RACIAL PURITY AND RACIAL SUPERIORITY

The Problem of Pure Races. One of reiterated racialist themes is *purity of race*. It is affirmed that pure races exist and that the decay of nations is invariably the consequence of race mixture. It is further argued that the historical fate of a nation depends upon its ability to retain its racial purity. The notion is charged with emotional force and defended vehemently. Racialists proclaim the "sacredness of pure race." Adolf Hitler demanded that the German must not fall into the "shame of mixing his

blood," although, in some despair, he admitted that he lived in an age of "racial poisoning." He spoke glowingly of a future German Order, which he described as "the brotherhood of templars round the Holy Grail of pure blood."

There is no scientific basis for the existence of pure races. In recorded history the peoples of the world have become so intermingled biologically that there is no possibility of the existence of an absolutely pure race anywhere. Even in the early days of social organization there was mixture of blood lines. In nomadic tribes, each possessing its own customs, no pure-blooded race could have existed, since the capture of women and children was followed by intermingling of blood lines. The only group which could have maintained blood purity would be one whose women were much too hideous to attract the men of any other tribe. "Every civilized group of which we have any record," wrote Ralph Linton, "has been a hybrid group, a fact which disposes effectively of the theory that hybrid peoples are inferior to pure-bred ones."

In 1924, Franz Boas, studying the problem of racial purity, came to the conclusion that in European village communities, in which the land had been held for centuries by the same families and in which the resident population was largely inbred, family strains were not identical, but on the contrary showed considerable differences in bodily as well as mental characteristics. To put it simply, Europe is a continent of "energetic mongrels."

Otto Ammon, German anthropo-sociologist, sought zealously to isolate a pure racial type. Yet, he was forced to admit that mathematical analysis demolished the idea: If two races, A and B, have intermingled in the proportion of two-thirds to one-third, then, with the provision that there has been no intervention of artificial limitation, the number of pure racial types of A and B after *n* generations will be $(2/3)^{2n}$ and $(1/3)^{2n}$, respectively. In the fourth generation there will be a mixture of 96% and in five generations of 100%. Ammon was forced reluctantly to conclude that when a people has mixed its blood for 300 years or more, it cannot possibly retain any individuals of pure blood. Ammon's analysis disappointed the racialists, but it did not discourage them.

The claim that geographical location may result in ra-

cial purity is flimsy. Boas, Goldenweiser, Kroeber, and other anthropologists dismissed the contention that Eskimos, under continuous interbreeding, are racially pure, and found instead that Eskimo physical traits varied from generation to generation. Boas found some twenty-one tribes in the region of Cumberland Sound and Davis Strait. Each group, he said, was *relatively* homogeneous, but there was no doubt that intermingling had gone on for centuries.

The juxtaposition of peoples has led to a now inextricable tangle of ethnic patterns. At most it would be possible to define a pure race in terms of the incidence of one particular somatic characteristic, but never in terms of all hereditary traits. The only people today who might with some justification be termed a *nearly pure race* would be the African pygmies, but even here there is no satisfactory proof. Jean Finot put it clearly: *"La pureté de sang n'est ainsi qu'un myth"*—purity of blood is nothing but a myth. Peoples today, commented Karl Pearson, are highly hybridized, and there are really but few fragments of pure races left. (*See Reading No. 7.*)

The Notion of Superior Races. As early as 1799, the racial superiority of the white European (later to be applied to the Aryan, Nordic, Teuton, and others) was proclaimed in this glowing passage by Charles White (1728-1813), an English surgeon:

> Where else shall we find that noble arched head, containing such a quantity of brain? . . . Where that variety of features, and fulness of expression; those long, flowing, graceful ring-lets; that majestic beard, those rosy cheeks and coral lips? . . . In what other quarter of the globe shall we find the blush that overspreads the soft features of the beautiful women of Europe, that emblem of modesty, of delicate feelings? . . . Where, except on the bosom of the European woman, two such plump and snowy white hemispheres, tipt with vermilion?

The idea of human inequality is not only universal but very old. It had its origins in the prejudices of early man, who suffered from xenophobia—fear of and distrust of the stranger. An attitude of racial superiority in one form or another has persisted throughout history. Robert E. Speer summarized this sentiment: "No one race is left

alone in the possession of the feeling of privilege and pride. It was and is an unessential defect of the heathen temper in men that they disbelieve in equality in the interest of the assertion of their superiority of status and privilege over other races. The ancient world was under this curse and the spirit of race superiority in the modern world perpetuates it."

It is commonly alleged and stated in various ways that mixed bloods combine the worst features of both parental groups and that they are always inferior to both parental stocks. At best, it is further claimed, mixed blood turns out to be *intermediate,* and, therefore, represents a debasement of the superior group. All hybrids become biologically, morally, and psychologically inferior, it is asserted. This, says the racialist, is most undesirable. He demands that the superior races retain their purity.

The idea of racial superiority is justified by racialists on three grounds—historical, biological, and psychological. Let us abridge the racialist arguments and the critiques in each case:

(1) *The Historical Argument in Support of Racial Superiority:* History provides adequate evidence for the superiority of the white race. The Indo-European Aryans, the Greeks and Romans, the Teutons, all of the white race, contributed high standards of culture to the march of civilization. Where non-white races have been distinguished by a high culture, they merely imitated the white race. When the white race is diluted or destroyed by inferior blood, it loses its virility and capacity for progress. The Egyptian civilization disappeared when the white race became mongrelized. Greece and Rome were eventually corrupted by bastardization. Germanic *Kultur* lost its impetus when Teutonic blood was poisoned. Interbreeding of races in Latin America was followed by cultural disintegration.

Critique of the Historical Argument: These views are rejected by critics as invalid. On the contrary, it is said, the growth and spread of civilization proceeded with a serene indifference to racial lines. The assertion that only the white race is capable of founding and sustaining culture cannot be demonstrated historically. The white races came into civilization rather late at a time when Chinese civilization had already progressed far beyond that exist-

ing in Europe. The Chinese made splendid cultural and intellectual contributions during an unbroken period of at least three thousand years, producing an exquisite and awe-inspiring art, workable rules of ethical and moral conduct, a practical and progressive science, and such inventions as paper, block printing, magnetic compass, and gunpowder. Were these the products of an inferior race? "All groups," said Ralph Linton, "who have had the opportunity to acquire civilization have not only acquired it but also added to its content. Conversely, no group has been able to develop a rich or complex culture when it was isolated from outside contacts."

(2) *The Biological Argument in Support of Racial Superiority:* The racialist is sure that the white man is "more beautiful" than the black, yellow, or red man. Moreover, it is claimed that he is further advanced physically on the road of evolution, irrefutable evidence of his racial superiority.

Critique of the Biological Argument: To this, anti-racialists counter that there is no proof that white stocks are physically superior to others. The size of the brain is unimportant when compared to the efficiency of its functioning. And furthermore, the matter of "beauty" is highly esthetic and allows for a wide difference of opinion. The performance of colored athletes would tend to negate the idea of physical inferiority.

(3) *The Psychological Argument in Support of Racial Superiority:* According to racialist theory, tests measuring the comparative mental abilities of white and colored races reveal the innate superiority of the white race. These differences, it is charged, are not environmental but inborn.

Critique of the Psychological Argument: To critics of this position, mental differences shown by psychological testing are due to various social levels and economic differences rather than inherited mental traits. The occurrence of hereditary mental traits of a particular race has never been proved. According to Franz Boas: "The available evidence makes it much more likely that the same mental traits appear in varying distribution among the principal racial groups. The behavior of an individual is therefore not determined by his racial affiliation, but by the character of his ancestry and his cultural environment. We may judge of the mental characteristics of families and individuals but not of races."

It is reasonable to conclude on the basis of evidence thus far that the differences between peoples are individual, not racial. Where differences do exist they may be traced primarily to environment—to political or economic or social causes—certainly not to race. In the words of Ruth Benedict: "No race has an exclusive claim to represent the final stage in human evolution; there is no valid argument to confirm that certain selected traits may indicate the superiority of the white race."

Race Mixture. Starting with the assumptions of racial purity, inequality, and superiority, racialists contend that human miscegenation, or race mixture, invariably has negative results. Cross-breeding makes a race lose its "stable and harmonic character" and produces a whole series of social evils and immoral tendencies. It leads to blood poisoning and decadence, with signs of degeneracy occurring in cross-bred stock, such as egalitarianism, democratic movements, and "the mediocre herd mind." The racialists recommend that such "race obliteration" be met by a campaign of purification.

The opposing school of anti-racialists denounces the racialist position on race mixture as not only unscientific, but inhuman and arrogant. Miscegenation, according to anti-racialists, has existed since the dawn of human life. Race mixture actually results in a greater somatic and psychic variability and allows the emergence of a great variety of new gene combinations, thus increasing the range of hereditary characteristics in the new group. Race mixture does not of itself produce biologically evil effects. The social results of race mixture, whether for good or ill, should be traced to social factors. From the biological point of view, the mixture of races is neither good nor bad, always being dependent on the individual characteristics of the persons among whom such cross-breeding takes place.

In a classic study of the Pitcairn Islanders, Harry L. Shapiro showed that the mingling of diverse strains resulted in heightened vigor. (*See Reading No. 8.*) A contemporary German writer, Herbert Wendt, denigrated the racialist illusion of superiority by citing the case of the "Rehoboth bastards," in which blood mixture between

eighteenth-century Hottentots and Boers resulted in a blend of people who were more successful then either of the original strains. This mixed group still exists, "healthy, hard-working, prolific farmers," in Southwest Africa today.

An in-between position on the matter of race mixture was taken by Henry Pratt Fairchild (1880-1956), New York University sociologist. To the anti-racialist contention that all the races of man can interbreed, and that such miscegenation is not harmful, Fairchild replied that we know almost nothing about this matter scientifically. "Not even an approximation of the data necessary for sound conclusions has been assembled."

"Permanence of Racial Character." Racialists insist that racial character is permanent and unchanging. This idea, they say, was the great scientific discovery of the nineteenth century, a discovery "which could be as clearly demonstrated as the revolution of the earth around the sun, the discoveries in geology, the circulation of the blood." Nations from the remotest ages, they affirm, have been marked by "certain physical peculiarities" which distinguish them from all other peoples. Contemporary Arabs are precisely what they were in the days of the patriarchs; the Hindus have not altered since they were described by the early writers; three thousand years have made no difference in the skin and hair of the Negro. Similarly, it is claimed, the characteristic features of the Jews may be recognized in the sculpture of the temples of Luxor and Karnak in Egypt, where they have been depicted for thirty centuries. Anti-racialists reject this concept of permanent racial character as an illusion as well as a worthless argument.

— 3 —

RACE AND HISTORY

Historical Development of Modern Racialism. Racialism, a relatively recent phenomenon, is historically a concomitant movement with modern nationalism and imperialism. There was little consciousness of race before the sixteenth century. The ancient world was a small world in which physical differences of peoples were not noticeable. For example, the Graeco-Roman peoples and the Germanic barbarians were not very different in physical character. Until the rise of national states in the late medieval and early modern eras, antagonisms between peoples were motivated chiefly by cultural, religious, and linguistic differences. Little was understood about intermarriage and racial intermixture.

According to the British statesman and historian Lord Bryce, self-conscious racial feeling hardly existed in any country until the French Revolution. "However much men of different races may have striven with one another, it was seldom any sense of racial opposition that caused their strife. They fought for land. They plundered one another. They sought glory by conquest. . . . But strong as patriotism and national feeling might be, they did not think of themselves in terms of ethnology, and in making war for every sort of reason they never made it for the sake of imposing their type of civilization. . . . In none of such cases did the thought of racial distinction come to the front."

From the sixteenth century onward, Europeans ranged the earth conquering native peoples and establishing themselves as conquering and ruling aristocracies. Especially during the era of colonization in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries and again in the era of neo-mercantilist revival called imperialism in the nineteenth century, ruling white men and subjugated black, brown, and red men

became increasingly conscious of their racial differences.

Until the late eighteenth century, thinking on race was distinguished chiefly by its verbosity. In theory, Christianity argued that all men were spiritually alike in the sight of God, but in practice, all sorts of arguments could be found to prove the inferiority of the black man. By the late eighteenth century, the Enlightenment was in full swing, and efforts were made for the first time to assure a scientific understanding of race. Biologists, building upon the pioneer studies of Linnaeus and Buffon, turned to the classification of races. Animals, as well as human beings, were arranged in systematic hierarchies. Distinctions were made between "higher" and "lower" races. European whites were placed at the summit in the hierarchy of races.

In the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, the discussion on race turned into a heated argument between monogenists and polygenists. The monogenists believed that all races resulted from a single creation. Varieties have arisen naturally from a once homogeneous stem. This concept was strengthened by two powerful allies: the Biblical story of creation from a single original human pair, and the doctrine of the brotherhood of man. The monogenistic view advocated an essential identity in kind of racial and specific differences; they originated in hereditary deviations. Monogenism was advocated by a long string of scholars including Hunter, Blumenbach, Camper, Zimmermann, Lawrence, Omalius, d'Halloy, Latham, Godwin, and others.

The polygenists, on the other hand, held that God created each race separately. Mankind, they said, is composed not of one but of several species. Adam and Eve were only the stem ancestors of the Jews, while other human species were descended from other pairs of stem ancestors. Advocates of this view included Virey, Desmoulins, C. H. Smith, Robert Knox, Nott, Gliddon, and Morton.

The advent of Darwinism and evolutionary thought strengthened the idea of the superiority and inferiority of races. In the first half of the nineteenth century, linguistic paleontologists began to confuse language with race, with the result that racialism began more and more to assume a pseudo-scientific character. The idea was once more

projected on a rising note of racial arrogance that physical appearance was an outward mark of an innate and permanent inferiority of non-European peoples.

Thus, we see the development of the race concept from verbosity, to rationalism, to pseudo-scientific racialism.

With the onset of imperialism in the late nineteenth century it became necessary to show that weaker races should die out to make room for the stronger. To substantiate this view, any argument became acceptable. Racialism became more and more irrational. The only important thing was to prove the inferior races as "outsiders," a kind of racial proletariat meant to be kept in subjugation. False, pseudo-scientific myths were used to justify the control of one people by another. "Race relations" became essentially social and economic, and race as such had little to do with the real situation. Yet, race differences were widely held to account for important cultural or economic differences and were used to excuse politically repressive actions.

Today, racialism, while scientifically outmoded and fallen from intellectual respectability, retains considerable historical importance. Systematic racial thought had strong influence on the growth and conduct of peoples in the Age of Imperialism. Our contemporary world took its political shape when racialism was at its height.

Race and Language. The identification of race and language is one of the more obvious fallacies in the lexicon of racialism. The two terms are used interchangeably without the slightest justification. There is a persistent notion that the race of peoples can be identified by the language they speak. There are these additional assertions:

(1) All people who speak one language are united by identical physical characteristics of one race.

(2) The superior qualities of the mother tongue indicate superior mental and physical qualities of the race.

(3) A language which is widely distributed throughout the world reveals the civilizing capacity of all those who have the good fortune to speak that tongue.

All these assumptions are invalid.

Historically, race, in its only intelligible (that is, *biological*) sense, is altogether indifferent to the development of

language. The French historian, Julien Havet (1853-1893), made this clear in a letter written to Salomon Reinach (1858-1932), the French archaeologist: "The truth is that language and race are two entirely distinct notions between which one must not for a single instant admit even the shadow of a likeness; no anthropological argument, under the smallest pretext, should contain a single word of linguistics, nor should any linguistic argument contain a single word of anthropology. When this essential separation has been resolved upon, both sciences may be made to progress. Till then we shall be only wasting paper and ink."

The structure of language is determined by factors quite apart from racial considerations. A nation may include people who speak the same language yet are of varied ethnic strains. A good example is to be found in the United States, where conglomerate ethnic groups speak an Americanized form of English.

Europe provides many arguments for the fallacy of linking race and language. The Scandinavian Northmen adopted the French language when they settled in France and the English tongue when they appeared in England. In northern Italy there is a percentage of Germanic blood, a vestigial remain of the barbarian migrations, but no survivals of Teutonic tongues. The Franks in Gaul and the Goths in Italy adopted vulgate Latin as their language. The Slavic peoples of the Balkan countries who came under the influence of Islam still speak Turkish dialects. Bulgarians have given up their original Finnish speech in favor of Slavic. Similarly, the Rumanian language, originally Latin in form, is becoming more and more Slavic.

Another example of the lack of correspondence between race and language may be found in the South Pacific. There are three ethnic groups in this area: Papuans in New Guinea and Melanesia; Malays in Indonesia; and Polynesians in the outer islands. Polynesians and Malays speak languages of their own group, while the Papuans' speech belongs partly to the Melanesians and partly to the unrelated language group of New Guinea. The racial division is Papuan-Polynesian, but the linguistic division is Malayan-Melanesian-Polynesian.

Often the term "Latin race" is used instead of the more precise "Latin civilization." Yet, there never has been a

Latin race. There were people who spoke Latin and spread their civilization over the major portion of Western Europe, including England and Germany. But neither the British nor Germans regard themselves as part of the Latin world. The relationship with Latin language and culture is close, while the measure of so-called Latin blood is minute.

Language, by its very nature, never has been, and cannot be, a test of race. Languages reflect socio-political developments, particularly migrations of peoples sweeping over countries regardless of ethnic boundaries. The use of a common language does not mean that all the individuals speaking it are of a common race. The fact that a person speaks English, Hebrew, Arabic, or Japanese is determined, not by biological heredity, but simply by what tongue he has learned in his environment.

Race and Culture. Race differs from culture. Race is essentially a question of *heredity,* while culture is one of *tradition.* Race is concerned with the inheritance of bodily characteristics, while culture is concerned with that which is transmitted through society. Thus, in a broad sense, culture includes the transmittal of customs or attitudes from previous generations, the continuation of legends by word of mouth, and the continuity of beliefs, knowledge, and literature. A whole structure of concepts, sentiments, institutions, and ideas is carried from one generation to another mainly through the vehicle of language.

In the popular mind it is fashionable to attribute gestures, bodily attitudes, even facial expressions to certain races. Yet, these are by no means racial attitudes, but, instead, cultural attributes acquired by a group through imitation or education. It is sometimes said that orthodox Jews, with their rigid rites and traditions, can be recognized by their outward similarity. This is, of course, true, but such outward similarity arises from traditional, linguistic, and religious attributes, in a word from Jewish culture, and certainly not from any distinct ethnic, morphological differences. While such cultural characteristics enable us to recognize some Jews, we fail to identify a much larger number of Jews who take on the traits of those people among whom they live. Here, again, we see the danger of identifying race with culture.

Still another fallacy is the attempt to find in the biology

of race an explanation for differences between the cultural achievements of peoples. Cultural diversity is almost always found in historical, not racial, factors. "The history of mankind," wrote Franz Boas, "proves that advances of culture depend upon the opportunities presented to a social group to learn from the experience of their neighbors." Peoples with high cultures owe their status to frequent contact with contrasting groups, certainly not to any inherent racial characteristics.

In the problem of heredity versus environment, racialists advocate the preeminence of heredity. Anti-racialists hold the opposite point of view—that environment is of greater importance for the human species. The powerful way in which society can mold the individual temperament was revealed by Ruth Benedict in her *Patterns of Culture* (Boston, 1934). The Kwakiutl Indians of the northwestern coast and the Pueblo Indians of the southwestern desert belong to the same major divisions of the Mongoloid peoples and have a similarity of biological inheritance. The Kwakiutl Indians led a life of frenzied competitiveness, always seeking to dominate others, always seeking to demonstrate their prestige, always loud and combative. The Pueblos, on the other hand, disapproved excesses of every kind, avoided competitiveness as useless and ill-advised, and were sober, kindly, quiet, and inoffensive. Thus, two groups of Amerindians, biologically very similar, developed behavior patterns, temperaments, and institutions that could scarcely have been less similar.

Race and Psychology. A central theme in the idea of racialism is that racial characteristics, physical or mental, are inherited. It is assumed that such characteristics remain unchanged. Heredity, it is said, sets an unvarying and unchanging pattern. Human reactions are automatic and instinctive. The influence of home, school, church, public opinion, and general cultural environment is dismissed as negligible, inasmuch as the character of the individual from birth is predestined by membership in a particular racial group.

In thus lauding heredity, racialists reject the idea that environmental conditions, as manifested in education, public opinion, and cultural development, can change the

physical and mental characteristics of a race within one or two generations. It is claimed that the Aryan, or the Celtic, or the Anglo-Saxon race is superior to others simply because it possesses superior inborn traits.

There is little satisfactory evidence for this point of view. Admittedly, it is incorrect to assume that heredity plays no part whatever in the existence of psychological differences. It is clear that *individuals* and *families* may not be equally endowed in either physical character or mental capacity. But this does not mean that entire races differ in their psychological inheritance. Each race, whether white, black, or yellow, contains individuals of superior, median, and inferior capacity. No one race contains all superior or all inferior individuals.

A great amount of research has been conducted among Negro, white, Indian, and Eskimo groups to determine the effects of environment on the races. Such testing is continuing. As yet there are no perfect answers. Thus far the evidence is overwhelming in favor of this conclusion: While it is likely that there are differences in the distribution of genetic elements determining personality in different ethnic groups, the study of cultural forms shows that such differences are insignificant when compared with the influence of the environment in which the group lives. There are no innate racial differences in intelligence. Descent of the individual plays a comparatively insignificant role in his behavior. The human organism is so plastic that it follows closely the pattern of cultural environment. Racial differences that have been established thus far are so much dependent on outer circumstances that no proofs can be stated for the existence of innate or inborn racial differences.

For this research, scholars devised the psychological test. The first scale of intelligence tests was introduced in 1905 by the French experimental psychologist Alfred Binet (1857-1911). Binet understood the faults of his system: he believed that his tests could be used to measure innate differences, *but only if the individuals or groups tested had substantially the same opportunities.* He was aware that the interpretation of test results depended upon many more factors than merely the innate capacity of the person tested, such as education, familiarity with subject

matter, motivations, emotions, knowledge of language, attitude toward the test itself, etc.

The intelligence test, then, is far from perfect as a measuring rod for differences between individuals and groups. It is not a completely objective method nor an unassailable technique. Psychologists are still searching for the culture-free test. Results obtained thus far indicate that: (1) Innate racial differences do not exist; and (2) as environmental opportunities for various social groups become more alike, the differences in test results tend to disappear.

Race and Nation. Loose usage of the terms race and nation as synonyms is responsible for much of the confusion surrounding both words. In popular thinking, race and nation are often identified as one and the same thing. "The reason is," according to Frederick Hertz (1878-), "that most people find it difficult to conceive a close social unity without a physical bond, and that they cannot think of common mentality without common blood. An intimate solidarity of fraternity between members of a nation seems to them to imply a real relationship between members of a family."

The average man may be forgiven for confusing the terms when even distinguished scholars speak again and again of the "British race." Many who consciously reject racialism unconsciously use its catchwords. Even Lord Bryce (1838-1922), in his *Race Sentiment as a Factor in History*, made the surprising comment that in the thought and imagination of every civilized people there is "an unquestionable racial strain," that "race sentiment is one of the elements that goes to make up national sentiment and national pride and helps to make a people cohesive." The psychologist, W. B. Pillsbury (1872-) called descent, *i.e.* race, a criterion of nationality and implied that a common physical descent is essential if a nation is to be made a unit in the best and fullest sense. The French philologist, Maximilien Paul Émile Littré (1801-1881), defined a nation as "a union of men inhabiting the same territory, whether or not subject to the same government, and possessing such common interests of long standing that they may be regarded as belonging to the same race."

Such invalid concepts as these contribute much to the

disorder, nebulosity, and lack of precision surrounding the entire idea of race. The term *nation* belongs properly within the sphere of the social sciences, while *race* is used in natural science. The nation designates historical and social characteristics that can be altered by society; race refers to hereditary, biological traits not easily changeable by education or assimilation. There never has been a British, a German, nor an American race, but there are British, German, and American nations.

"A nation," in the words of the British historian, Ernest Barker (1874-1960), "is not the physical fact of one blood, but the mental fact of one tradition. A gulf is fixed between the race and nation. The one is a common physical type; the other is a common mental content. The one is a natural fact which is already given at the dawn of history; the other is an artificial structure acquired by the thinking, feeling, and willing of human minds in the course of history."

Sir Arthur Keith (1879-1944), British anthropologist, saw the problem in a slightly different light. In his estimation, when a land is peopled with a mixture of old races, a new effort at race-building is initiated sooner or later, just as a wren's nesting instincts are re-awakened as soon as the first nest is destroyed. "A nation always represents an attempt to become a race; nation and race are but different degrees of the same evolutionary movement."

The fact is that parallels do exist between race and nation. It is, indeed, possible that a nation may acquire a number of similar traits by isolation and inbreeding, and, when it mixes with another group of different acquired traits, a population may result that possesses some of the characteristics of one group, of the second parent group, and of an intermediate, intermingled group. But this is rare, and it is difficult if not impossible to measure these variable factors.

Race and Nationalism. Nationalism, too, admits of no simple definition. Like other historical innovations of the modern period, it is a complex phenomenon, with vague and mysterious overtones. It may usefully be defined as a condition of mind, feeling, or sentiment of a group of people living in a well-defined geographical area, speaking a common language, possessing a literature in

which the aspirations of the nation have been expressed, attached to common traditions, and, in some cases, possessing a common religion. There are, of course, exceptions to every part of this definition.

In its integral form ("our country, right or wrong!"), nationalism is the twin and alter ego of racialism. Both movements emerged as dynamic factors of almost immeasurable cultural and politico-economic significance in our times. With the sharpening of rivalries among national states, nationalism assumed a form decidedly hostile to liberalism and humanitarianism. Integral nationalists rejected sympathy for and coöperation with other nations, promoted jingoism and militarism, and opposed all personal liberties when they interfered with the aims of the state. They were attracted by the idea of racialism, with its emphasis upon racial purity and racial superiority, with its exclusiveness and distrust for the outsider. They identified nation with race and used the terms interchangeably. A nation was superior, they claimed, because it was composed of a people of superior race.

Race and Imperialism. In the decade after 1870 there was a revival of neo-mercantilism, called the New Imperialism, a new era of overseas expansion by which European nations engaged in a scramble for rich territories in Africa, Asia, and the Near and Middle East. The basic motive for such expansion was economic, but together with it was a strong psychological pattern. Exaggerated national self-consciousness entered an acute stage. Poets and historians began to speak about the historic mission of expansion. Nationalism merged into imperialism; both were saturated with the same romanticism and mysticism. There was talk about "a place in the sun," "manifest destiny," "the lamp of life," and, particularly, "the white man's burden." (*See Reading No. 9.*)

Racialism, with nationalism and imperialism, formed the third branch of this historically significant trident. Although there was no justification for asserting that one race was intellectually superior to another, imperialists assumed that special aptitudes were inherent in the mental make-up of the white European. This was the teleological view of race differences: God had created unequal races. This inequality had a purpose. European whites were

more intelligent than the African blacks, hence the former had the right and duty to direct the labor of the latter. The imperialist-minded were certain that the blacks, who had strong backs but weak minds and a lazy disposition, would work better under European direction.

There was no more justification for this attitude than for the custom in the ancient world of placing all non-Greek (later non-Graeco-Roman) peoples in the category of "barbarians." In the imperialist view, Europeans were civilized champions of social progress, while black Africans and yellow Chinese were "savages." This argument was combined with a high-flown cultural arrogance to excuse expansionism. Imperialists conveniently forgot that there were many more human cultures than human races. For the racialists Rudyard Kipling was merely stating a fact of life when he wrote of

> Your new-caught sullen peoples,
> Half devil and half child.

Granted that the white man brought great vitality and energy as well as industrialization to Africa and Asia, it should also be added that he brought with him such badges of civilization as gin, the acquisitive urge, syphilis, and other diseases. Moreover, the basic arts of civilization, discovered in Neolithic times—agriculture, stock-rearing, pottery, and weaving—were introduced long before the era of the Western white man. The fact that the white man improved these discoveries in a period of 10,000 years by no means gave him the right to claim racial superiority.

The image of racial superiority has continued into the twentieth century and into recent years at a time when Western imperialism is losing its impetus and drive. Into the vacuum has come the Soviet Union, which has constructed its own tremendous empire based on white colonialism or the subjugation of contiguous peoples who happen to be white. Meanwhile, in the areas of Africa and Asia once subjected to Western imperialism, Africans and Asians respond to emotional racial appeals with curt disregard for logic and fact. Here we witness a kind of reverse racialism. Congolese soldiers slaughter a dozen Italian troops serving with the United Nations because

the white Italians are mistaken for hated Belgians. In Ceylon, the Singhalese majority keep the Tamil minority in subjection on racial grounds. Efforts in India to wipe out the caste system make painfully slow progress. In Japan, thousands of lower-class Eta are forced into ghettos and denied a normal social life. Apparently, there is no limit to human self-deception. As racialism recedes in the Western world, it rises now in Africa and Asia, where new nations seek to emulate the West's older form of nationalism and racialism.

Race Conflict. One of the most potent elements of contemporary socio-political unrest, race conflict is also one of the most dangerous, surrounded as it is by emotion, passion, and fear. Once started, it progresses like a brush fire.

Historically, race conflicts had their origin in the migration of races and in the conquest of one people by another. In North America, the invading white man, who considered himself on a level above the native red Indian, drove the latter into small confined areas or exterminated him altogether. We have seen the nature of race conflict in nineteenth-century imperialism. Always the process followed the attempt of a stronger or more advanced race to invade the territory of a weaker race. The oppressed race, finding its social and cultural structure radically changed by the invasion, responded with a new or heightened racial consciousness.

The major contemporary areas of race conflict are Africa, Asia, and the United States. Only a few years ago Africa was regarded as a Dark Continent inhabited by backward races. There was little discontent, little dynamism. But today the entire continent is seething with unrest, tension, and change. New and critical problems have arisen as the old colonial rule is being liquidated. Ghana, the Congo, South Africa—these and other states have become new laboratories of race relations.

There are similar problems in Asia, where two thousand years of racial movement and mixture have produced a population of infinite diversity. There are no pure races left in Asia, but there is a residue of racial conflict. Asians passionately hate Western imperialism. The prestige of the white man has evaporated in Asia.

After World War II, the peoples of Asia, usually typed as phlegmatic, fatalistic, and conditioned to lack of change, called loudly for independence. For the white man, whom they condemned as the source of all Asia's troubles, they expressed resentment and seething anger.

In the United States, race conflict took the form of a continuing struggle of the Negro American for equal political and socio-economic rights. There are about 15,000,000 Negroes in the United States, most of them descended from slaves brought from Africa after 1619 and until the Civil War, 1861-1865. In recent years, pointing to the doctrine of human equality and of the natural or divine rights of man (the American Declaration of Independence and the American Constitution), such organizations as the National Association for the Advancement of Colored Peoples (N.A.A.C.P.), the Committee on Racial Equality (C.O.R.E.), and the Urban League called for a speed-up in Negro rights. If these rights were not granted on a citizenship basis, then they would be fought for on a racial basis. "Freedom Riders" ranged through the South demanding desegregation and the implementation of the U.S. Supreme Court decision on educational desegregation.

These conflicts were primarily concerned with color. On a different level, the Jewish "race" was attacked as destructive, imitative, and culturally unfit. With the accession of Hitler to power in 1933, the theory of the Aryan-Jewish clash was accepted as an official doctrine of the German state. Some 6,000,000 Jews were slaughtered by Hitler's Nazis in a horrible, inhuman climax of racial conflict.

Racial Prejudice. Racial prejudice, the main prop of racialism, has deep historical roots. Prejudice of one people against another has existed throughout the course of history. There are many examples. In the *Rigveda* (X.22.8), the oldest sacred book of the Hindus, is an expression of the usual pre-condition of racial prejudice: "We are surrounded on all sides by Dasyu tribes. They do not perform sacrifices; destroyer of foes! Kill them. Destroy the Dasa race." No age has been free of group prejudice and no society has existed without it. By the nineteenth century, racial prejudice was accompanying

political movements and had become a virulent historical force. Conditions conferred upon this distorted and emotional sentiment a pragmatic reality. In the words of A. L. Kroeber (1876-): "The apparently theoretical beliefs held as to race capacity by people who are actually confronted by a race conflict or problem are by no means the outcome of impartial examination and verification, but are the result of the decisions taken and emotions experienced in the course of acts performed toward the other race."

There are many causes for racial prejudice, some fickle and emotional, others derived from and excused by national feeling:

Economic: Deep chasms arise between men because of economic needs or rivalries. The prejudiced seek material advantages and benefits. Prejudice can always provide an excuse or rationalization for economic exploitation, as, for example, in imperialism. Similar techniques can be used locally by manipulating wages and rent in such a way that certain groups are obliged to live in segregated areas.

Political: Modern dictators cater to feelings of racial superiority to obtain, retain, and extend their personal power. In democracies, too, politicians sometimes base their campaigns on appeals to racial prejudice. German anti-Semitism after 1871, the Tsarist pogroms after 1880, and the Dreyfus case in France beginning in 1894 all had political undertones of racial prejudice.

Socio-cultural: Racial prejudice may grow as a result of cultural differences between peoples. Orientals resisted the influx of Western customs and traditions because they dreaded change in their long-established institutions. Each culture despised the other as a barbarian or backward race. Barriers of language accentuated the cultural differences.

Psychological: There is also an irrational element, the belief in the physical and mental superiority of chosen races, which cannot be explained in political or cultural terms. For example, in South Africa, all differences of nationality or class among the whites disappeared quickly once the native problem became critical.

Religious: Religious differences, too, are apt to create

racial antagonisms. Though the doctrine of most major religions abhors violence and injustice, it still remains true that there have been periods of violence between Christians and Muslims, between Catholics and Protestants, between Western and Eastern religions. Nonbelievers, especially those of another race, are condemned as agents of evil, as advocates of heresy and corruption.

Biological: Still another cause of racial prejudice is exaggeration of physical traits of other peoples. Individuals with different physical features are regarded as obnoxious.

All these causes may exist in part or in combination. Racial prejudice is neither instinctive nor inborn. If it were, then all children would show unreasoning prejudice in their early contacts with other ethnic types, which is obviously not the case. Prejudice is learned, in the home, in the school, in textbooks, even in imaginative child's play.

— 4 —

THE ORIGIN AND DEVELOPMENT OF THE ARYAN MYTH

Doctrine of Aryanism. Racialists, not satisfied with merely proclaiming the superiority of the white over the colored race, also felt it necessary to erect a hierarchy within the white race itself. To meet this need they developed the myth of Aryan, or Nordic, superiority. The Aryan myth in turn became the source of other secondary myths such as Teutonism (Germany), Anglo-Saxon-

ism (England and the United States), and Celticism (France). These myths have been exploded, but they, nevertheless, have had considerable influence on the course of recent history, affecting the actions of individuals as well as nations.

Role of Linguistic Paleontology. In 1788, the British Orientalist, Sir William Jones (1746-1794), settled the foundations of modern comparative philology when he observed that similarities between the Greek, Sanskrit, Latin, Persian, Celtic, and German languages could be explained only by the existence of a common ancestral tongue. "There is a . . . reason . . . for supposing that both the Gothick and the Celtick, though blended with a very different idiom, had the same origin with the Sanskrit." This pioneer observation on the similarities between languages led Thomas Young (1773-1829), a British physician, who was the first to decipher the Rosetta Stone, to use the term "Indo-European" to designate the common root of this family of languages.

From this time on, a group of philologists who called themselves linguistic paleontologists (paleontologists deal with the life of past geological periods based on the study of fossils) began to identify language with race. Soon there emerged the Aryan myth—the idea that the Indo-European group of languages was exactly the same as the Indo-European race. This identity of language and race was assumed even though there was not the slightest proof for the identification.

Then the term Indo-European was replaced by Indo-Germanic, a designation made general in the works of James Cowles Prichard (1786-1848), a British philologist and ethnologist, and Franz Bopp (1791-1867), a German linguist. Bopp, who is credited with initiating the era of modern linguistics, also helped confuse the issues. In his major work, *Comparative Grammar,* which appeared in six parts from 1833 to 1852, Bopp painstakingly compared significant words in various languages as he sought to find original grammatical constructions and phonetic laws. He concluded that the great Indo-European linguistic family included seven branches—Greek, Italian, Teutonic, Slavonic, Lithuanic, and Albanian. There were other closely related Asiatic groups,

he said, notably the Iranic (especially Zend and Persian), Indic (a series of modern Indian tongues), and Armenian (a combination of Greek and Iranian). With zealous national pride, Bopp named his family of languages *Indo-Germanic,* thereby alienating Frenchmen and Englishmen, who preferred the term Indo-European.

At this point the stream of racialism merged with the currents of romanticism and nationalism. Romanticism, reasserting imagination and sentiment and emphasizing individualism in thought and expression, was a reaction against eighteenth-century rationalism. It was a potent factor in the rise of nationalism, especially German nationalism. Bopp's laudation of the great Indo-Germanic family was but one expression of a rising German nationalism. There were many others who worked along the same lines, notably Johann Gottlieb Fichte (1762-1814), who tried to prove the existence of a tri-logic of race, language, and nation; Georg Wilhelm Friedrich Hegel (1770-1831), who praised the Prussian monarchy as representing civilization at its zenith; the brothers Grimm, Jakob Ludwig Karl (1785-1863) and Wilhelm Karl (1786-1859), who stimulated German national pride by philological studies and fairy tales; Karl Lachmann (1793-1851), disciple of the Grimms, who sought diligently for primitive racial kinships; the brothers von Schlegel, Karl Wilhelm Friedrich (1772-1829) and August Wilhelm (1767-1845), specialists in Oriental studies; Johann Gottfried von Herder (1744-1803), who emphasized the uniqueness and coherence of German national culture; and others. There emerged the theme of the German as an ideal racial type, as the apotheosis of all that was noble and great. This persistent Aryan myth culminated finally in Hitler's pronunciamento that "true intellectual achievements have never been made by racial aliens, but always by strictly German spiritual forces."

The Aryan was the creation of Friedrich Max Müller (1823-1900), Anglo-German philologist and Orientalist. In the years 1859-1861, fashionable carriages rattled up Albemarle Street in London to the Royal Institute and discharged aristocratic passengers who had come to listen to the lectures of the distinguished German scholar at Oxford. The professor dominated his audiences. The

good ladies of London were thrilled by the eloquence of Professor Müller, who held them spellbound with tales about their Aryan ancestry. Not only the ladies of London, but also scholars throughout the world, were impressed by the erudite German professor. Müller repeatedly hammered away at the idea that the terms Indo-European and Indo-Germanic must be replaced by Aryan, because the people who invaded India and who spoke Sanskrit called themselves Arya. This primitive Aryan language indicated that there was an *Aryan race,* the common ancestor of Germans, Celts, Romans, Slavs, Greeks, Persians, and Hindus.

Starting with an acquired theory of "irresistible impulse," Müller described the migrations of the early Aryans, who, like a swarm from a central beehive, surged into northwestern Europe. "The main stream of the Aryan nations," he wrote in his *History of Ancient Sanskrit Literature* (1859), "has always flowed toward the northwest. No historian can tell us by what impulse those adventurous nomads were driven on through Asia toward the isles and shores of Europe. . . . It requires a strong will, or a great amount of alertness, to be able to withstand such national or rather ethnical movements."

Müller presented no proof for his identification of the Aryans as a race, nor did any other scholars. Eventually, Müller himself recognized his error. In 1888, with rare scholarly courage and integrity, he repudiated his earlier view: "To me an ethnologist who speaks of Aryan race, Aryan blood, Aryan eyes and hair, is as great a sinner as a linguist who speaks of a dolichocephalic dictionary or a brachycephalic grammar." (*See Reading No. 10.*) He now insisted that Aryan in scientific language was utterly inapplicable to race. It meant language and nothing but language, he said, and if one were to speak of an Aryan race at all, it should be nothing more than Aryan speech.

But the damage was already done. By this time the Aryan myth had been appropriated by the racialists. It was to become the main weapon in their arsenal of ideas.

Search for the Elusive Aryan. Long and fruitless was the search for the original homeland of the Aryans. There is no such thing as an Aryan race, yet energetic attempts

were made to trace its place of origin. The home of the parent Aryan group was placed in three widely separated areas—Asia, Europe, and North Africa:

Proponents of the Theory of Asiatic Origin

J. G. Rhodes (1820): Central Asia
W. von Schlegel (1820): Central Asia
F. A. Pott (1840): Valleys of Oxus and Jaxartes, slopes of Hindu-Kush mountains
C. Lassen (1847): Slopes of Hindu-Kush mountains
J. Grimm (1848): Asia
A. H. Sayce (1874): Central Asia
Van der Gheyn (1881): Plateau of Pamur
O. Schrader (1890): Eurasian steppe lands
S. Reinach (1892): Central Asia

Proponents of the Theory of European Origin

Bulwer-Lytton (1842): North of the Black Sea
J. J. d'Omalius d'Holloy (1848): Europe
R. G. Latham (1851): Europe
T. Benfey (1868): Temperate plains of Europe
T. Pösche (1878): Germany
Von Loeher (1883): Baltic plains
K. Penka (1883): Germany
H. Hale (1888): Europe
H. Hirt (1892): Baltic plains
M. Much (1904): Northwest Europe
H. H. Bender (1922): Europe
H. F. K. Günther (1933): Northwest Germany

Proponents of the Theory of African Origin

D. G. Brinton (1890): Western Europe and North Africa
G. Sergi (1901): North Africa

Undecided

A. Schleicher (1862): Central Europe or Asia
W. D. Whitney (1867): Europe or Asia
T. Mommsen (1876): Valley of Euphrates (?)
I. Taylor (1888): Europe or Asia
A. H. Keane (1895): North Africa or Eurasian steppe area
V. G. Childe (1926): Central Asia or Europe

Asiatic Origin: Those who held the theory of Asiatic origin believed that a Proto-Aryan culture originated

around the slopes of the Hindu-Kush mountains in Asia and then was diffused into Europe. These early Aryans, it was said, became the ancestors of the Persians, Hindus, Greeks, Celts, and Germans. They were "a tall, dolichocephalic people," nomads who knew something about agriculture. Eventually, these Aryans, speaking Sanskrit, became the ruling race of India and gave to Europe all its languages excepting Turkish, Magyar, Finnish, and Basque. There were repeated invasions of Europe from the Eurasian steppe lands. Eventually, according to this theory, the Ayrans split into three main divisions:

Teutons: Tall, fair-haired, long-headed, blue-eyed, such as Goths, Lombards, Norsemen

Alpines: Short, medium-sized, round-headed, brown-haired, found in Switzerland

Mediterraneans: Dark, under-sized, round-headed, black-haired, found in Spain, Italy, France, and Greece, resulting from a mixture of Aryans and Eurafricans.

European Origin: About the middle of the nineteenth century, such scholars as Bulwer-Lytton, d'Holloy, Latham, and others, argued that, since inflected languages are more highly developed in Europe than in Asia, the Asiatic theory of origin of the Aryans was mythical. Scandinavia, Northern Germany, and the Danube Valley were designated as probable places of origin. Some chose Germany as the home of the original Proto-Aryans by assuming that Germany's geographical situation in the heart of Europe was favorable for expansion either northward or southward. H. H. Bender, Professor of Indo-Germanic Philology at Princeton University, reasoned as follows (1922): No part of Asia agrees as well as Europe with the historical distribution of the Aryans, with the relations of the various languages to one another, and with all that is known or surmised of the primitive Aryans. Eastern Europe embraces the forests that are indicated by the names of certain Indo-European trees and animals (*beech, birch,* and *honey-bee*).

African Origin: According to Giuseppi Sergi (1841-1936), the Italian anthropologist, there was an original Eurafrican race which included among others dolichocephalic Scandinavians and Teutons. The latter migrated

northward from Africa and then spread across the Danube to the Russian and Asiatic steppes. But Sergi got into difficulties: on the one hand, he saw the Aryans as an Eurasiatic species, the physical character of their skeletons being different from the Eurafricans, and on the other he showed the so-called Teutons to have dolichocephalic skulls, "identical in character with the Mediterranean and Hamitic types," being therefore of African origin. The American anthropologist, D. G. Brinton, supporting the African theory of origin, believed that "the original Aryac tribe was a mixture of blonds and brunettes, with a majority of the latter."

In 1936 Paul Buyssens, a Belgian, wrote about three races—the Mediterranean, Nordic, and Negro, all of which (pure dolichocephalic races!) evolved from the African pygmies. In prehistoric times, said Buyssens, the Negro invaded Europe, and there were similar invasions by the Mediterraneans and also by the Nordics. Thus, the Occidental race is a mixture of the Nordic and Mediterranean. Alexander Goldenweiser (1880-1940), American anthropologist, dismissed this view as in singular disregard of method and the rules of harnessing evidence. "There is no rancor here," wrote Goldenweiser in a review, "merely a mild form of insanity."

This unrewarding search for the original homeland of the Aryan occupied the time of many scholars, especially philologists and anthropologists. For the racialist, the search itself was unimportant. He liked the word Aryan because it was taken from an old Sanskrit legend and meant "noble" or "pure." For him Aryan meant nobility of blood, incomparable beauty of form and mind, a superior breed. Every worthwhile achievement in history, he assumed, has been made by the Aryan race, and all civilization is a struggle to the death between creative Aryan and disintegrative Jew.

This view of Aryan nobility persists even though there is no Aryan race. Cyril Bibby put it this way: "To speak of an 'Aryan race' is as great an abuse of words as to speak of a 'black-skinned language.'" All attempts to correlate the Aryan language with the Aryan race are not only unsuccessful, but absurd. Undoubtedly, there existed a parent tongue, whether it be called Aryan, Indo-

European, or Indo-Germanic. Search for this original language has been complicated by the fact that the early peoples who spoke it have disappeared and have left few or no written records of their speech. There is neither ethnic nor cultural uniformity among so-called Aryan peoples. Ethnic stocks have become lost in chaotic confusion. Aryan racialism has been described as sociopolitical rationalization with no scientific support. This is, perhaps, a fancy way of indicating that it is nonsense. This conclusion was stated by Frank H. Hankins:

> The obvious impossibility of ever locating the Aryan homeland; the increasing complexity of the problem . . . ; the even more remote possibility of ever learning anything conclusive regarding the traits of the mythical 'Aryan' . . . ; the ridiculous and humiliating spectacle of eminent scholars subordinating their interest in truth to the inflation of racial and national pride—all these and many other reasons led scholars of the first rank even before 1890 to declare that the Aryan doctrine was a figment of the professional imagination or that it was incapable of classification because the crucial evidence was lost, apparently forever.

Arthur de Gobineau, Apostle of Aryanism. The doctrine of Aryanism received its most potent stimulus through the work of Joseph Arthur, Comte de Gobineau (1816-1882), a French diplomatist, publicist, and founder of the cult of Gobinism. Descendant of a burgher family traced to the seventeenth century, Gobineau sought at first to prove the nobility of his family's origin (he was altogether fascinated and intrigued by his own blond beauty) and ended by elevating budding racialism into an important historical movement.

Between 1835 and 1855 Gobineau published a four-volume work, *Essai sur l'inégalité des races humaines,* which became the bible of racialist literature. (*See Reading No. 11*). His thesis was simple: all human races are anatomically, physically, and psychologically unequal. Why do civilizations degenerate and fall? Not through fanaticism, luxury, corruption of morals, irreligion or bad government—these are unmeaning accidents. A civilization will certainly die, Gobineau maintained, when the primordial race-unit is so broken up and swamped by

the influx of foreign elements that its effective qualities are destroyed. So long as the blood and institutions of a nation keep to a sufficient degree the impress of the original nation, that nation will continue to exist.

As soon as isolated groups grow great and civilized, Gobineau continued, when the majority of their people have mixed blood flowing in their veins, only then do they assert that all men are equal. But all men are not equal. If they were, why is it that every nation adds to the names of others epithets that suggest unlikeness (for example, the Romans ridiculed "cowardly Graeco-Romans, irreligious Carthaginians, and seditious Alexandrians")?

Christianity, Gobineau said, neither created nor changed the capacity for civilization. All human races can recognize the truths of Christianity, but this must not be confused with the "very different faculty" which leads one race, and not another, to rise higher on the ladder of civilization.

Gobineau further believed that every human activity, whether moral or intellectual, has its original source in one or the other of two currents, the "male materialistic current" and the "female intellectual current." Only the races which have one of these elements in abundance, without, of course, lacking altogether the other, can reach a high state of civilization. This argument was of extraordinary appeal to German racialists. Our present civilization "has been created by the mingling of the Germanic tribes with the races of the ancient world." And further: "The richness, variety, and fertility of invention of which we honor our modern societies, are the natural, and more or less, successful result of the maimed and disparate elements which our Germanic ancestors instinctively knew how to use, temper, and disguise."

Gobineau announced himself as categorically opposed to the notion of a multiplicity of origins of the human species. Racial differences, he said, are permanent. Races are unequal in strength or beauty. There are only three races: the white (Caucasian, Semitic or Japhetic); the black (Hamitic); and the yellow (Altaic, Mongol, Finnish, and Tatar). He rejected Blumenbach's five varieties

and many sub-varieties and Prichard's seven on the ground that they included "notorious hybrids."

The white race, said Gobineau, was the superior race. All civilizations derive from the white race, and none can exist without its help. "A society is great and brilliant only so far as it preserves the blood of the noble group that created it." And again: "There is no true civilization, among the European peoples, where the Aryan branch is not prominent." And finally: "European peoples degenerate only in consequence of the various admixtures of blood which they undergo; their degeneration corresponds exactly to the quantity and quality of the new blood."

Gobineau's *Essay* is an imposing and passionately earnest work. But the tone of earnest conviction is not enough to mask the fact that this is a notoriously bad book. It is filled with paradoxes, contradictions, and inconsistencies. The historical construction, in both general features and details, is weak. Not one single important observation, even when in itself seemingly true, may be taken as proved on the authority of the author. Objections arise at every turn. The reader will always want proofs—but they are not forthcoming.

Gobineau's contention that racial types are permanent does not bear close scrutiny. He described "the strict and unassailable permanence" of form and feature of the ancient peoples, "to which the earliest documents bear witness," but he produced no early documents to prove his point. The racial type, he argued, is never affected by climate, region, or lapse of time. But he gave no proofs, nor did he provide an explanation for the existence of black Jews in Abyssinia.

Examples of Gobineau's many contradictions: "By *black* men I mean Hamites." But in a preceding chapter: "The Hamites are unreasonably considered to be of Negro origin." The white race is superior in beauty and physical strength, but the "happiest" blend from the viewpoint of beauty is made by the marriage of white and black!

In the final pages of the first volume appears Gobineau's theme and his most glaring inconsistency. The noble Aryan race, he says, is degenerating because of the

primary error of race intermixture. At the same time, the great Aryan race is the savior of mankind and is leading it to a higher and more civilized plane. Gobineau seemed to be constitutionally incapable of making up his mind. Nor was he aware of his own inconsistencies and contradictions.

Gobineau's racialism was distinctly a class concept. Always the uncompromising aristocrat, he lived in a France moving away from his ideas of aristocracy and absolutism. Frenchmen were not impressed by his theories. Tocqueville, who was attracted by Gobineau's ingenuity, nevertheless rejected his racial ideology as false. "At best," Tocqueville said, "your fame will be an echo from across the Rhine."

Tocqueville was precisely right. After the Franco-Prussian War of 1870-71, Aryanism became a nationalist dogma in the newly unified German state. German intellectuals were intrigued by Gobineau's insistence that one race and one alone was capable of creating a true civilization. Here was pleasant, even if unscientific, verification of Germany's right to world leadership. Gobineau's exaggerated praise for the early Germanic tribes was taken to mean laudation for the contemporary German citizen, though this was far removed from Gobineau's original idea. A gullible and credulous German public readily swallowed the thesis of Teutonic racial supremacy.

Gobineau was introduced to the German public by the composer Richard Wagner, who believed Aryanism to be the perfect explanation for the superiority of the German spirit. Professor Ludwig Schemann, impressed by Gobineau's "all-conquering strength," founded the Gobineau Vereinigung in 1894 at Freiburg. "All good Germans," said Schemann, "regard Gobineau as one of the most extraordinary men of the nineteenth century, one of the greatest God-inspired heroes, saviors and liberators sent by Him across the ages." Gobineau societies appeared all over Germany. Gobineau's works were published in classic editions. In Nazi Germany he was revered as a prophet and as the great forerunner of the truths of racialism.

From Aryan to Nordic. Under the influence of the new racialism, German philologists, ethnologists, and an-

thropologists, although entranced by Gobineau's Aryanism, began to use the term Nordic instead of Aryan. The Nordic type was said to be one of the main divisions of the Caucasian race (Mediterranean, Alpine, and Nordic). The early conception of the Nordic included Scandinavians, Northwest Germans, Dutch, Flemings, most English, Scots, some Irish, Anglo-Americans, Anglo-Australians, English and Dutch of South Africa, Thrako-Hellenes, "true" Kurds, most West Persians, Afghans, and Kafirs. Later, the term Nordic was restricted to Germans and Scandinavians.

The Nordic thesis, as propounded by the German racialist, Hans F. K. Günther, held that the original Nordics were a Neolithic people who eventually settled in Central and Southern Germany, wandered to the Balkans, into Italy, and then into France and Spain. This thesis followed the main outlines of the Indo-Europeanization of the continent, but, according to the Nordic school, the "original Nordic blood" of these people disappeared. Nordic blood of the ruling class (nobles and freemen), it was said, still flows in its purest form in the veins of Germans (Chamberlain and Günther) or of Frenchmen (Gobineau). "The Nordic race stands at the head of the whole human genus" (Lothrop Stoddard). "All blue, gray or green eyes in the world today came originally from the same source, namely the Nordic race of Northern Europe. . . . Blond hair also comes everywhere from the Nordic subspecies and from nowhere else. . . . The Nordic race is nearly everywhere distinguished by great stature" (Madison Grant). "The Nordic entered history to rescue agonizing humanity from the clutches of the bestial" (Chamberlain). "The Nordic man is distinguished by a highly developed sense of reality, which, in combination with an energy that may rise to boldness, urges him on to far-reaching undertakings" (Günther). To prevent *denordicization,* or disappearance of Nordic blood, became the great historical mission of the present descendants of the Nordic *Urmensch.*

Houston Stewart Chamberlain and Nordic Teutonism. Gobineau gave the Aryan myth form and content, but it remained for an Englishman, son of a British admiral, to take over the Aryan race doctrine and fashion

it into a battle hymn of Nordic-Teutonic racial supremacy. Houston Stewart Chamberlain (1855-1927), born at Southsea, published (1896) a biography of Richard Wagner, whose daughter he had married. Eventually, he became a naturalized German. His admiration of all things German was coupled with an equally intense hatred for anything concerned with England. During World War I, he wrote propaganda pieces directed at his native land.

In 1899, Chamberlain published the first edition of his *Foundations of the Nineteenth Century,* which was immediately hailed in Germany as a historical masterpiece. (*See Reading No. 12.*) Although it was an expensive volume, more than 60,000 copies were sold as soon as Kaiser Wilhelm II discovered it to be "a work of the highest importance." Within three years three editions were exhausted. Before its appearance in an English translation in 1909, it went through eight editions.

Chamberlain's aim was to reveal the bases on which the nineteenth century, "an inexhaustible theme," rested. In the first part, he discussed in detail the events previous to the year 1200: the legacy of the old world, with chapters on Hellenic art and philosophy, Roman law, and the revelation of Christ; the heirs of the old world, with chapters on racial chaos, the entrance of the Jews into Western history, and the Germanic invasions; and the struggle of the heirs to maintain their inheritance, with chapters on religion and the state. In the second part, dealing with events from 1200 to 1800, Chamberlain described the Teutons as the creators of a new culture.

According to Chamberlain, the entrance of the Teutonic race into the history of the world formed an opposing positive force to the spread of the diminutive but influential race of Jews. "To this day these two powers—Jews and Teutonic races—stand, wherever the recent spread of the Chaos had not blurred their features, now as friendly, now as hostile, but always as alien forces face to face."

In his second volume, Chamberlain analyzed the rise of the Teutonic world and the struggle of the great powers for supremacy and possession. The work of Teutonism is "beyond question the greatest that has hitherto

been achieved by man." "What is not Teutonic consists either of alien elements not yet exorcised, which were formerly forcibly introduced and still, like baneful germs, circulate in our blood, or of alien wares sailing, to the disadvantage of our work and further development, under the Teutonic protection and privilege, and they will continue to sail thus, until we send these pirate ships to the bottom." Chamberlain argued that all achievements in science, industry, political economy, and art were stimulated and propelled by the Teutonic race. The nineteenth century, in his view, rested upon a secure Teutonic foundation.

Chamberlain's book received a mixed reaction. In Germany it was hailed as a masterpiece for its vast learning, its splendid critical acumen, and the method in which the facts were marshaled in support of his thesis. Some German critics called it "one of the most significant historical works of the nineteenth century." Others praised it for its vast and powerful edifices of argument.

British reaction was quite different. Reviewers accused Chamberlain of being "a turn-coat son of Britain," "a renegade Englishman," "a street-corner preacher now assuming the toga of Roman oratory and now the robes of Christian ceremony," a man whose work was "the crapulous eructations of a drunken cobbler." One critic dismissed the book as "a clever synthesis of Schopenhauerism and Gobinism reflecting the more audacious and brutal affirmations of the mystical alliances between Teutonism and the divinity of progress."

Theodore Roosevelt, the former American President, reviewed the *Foundations* in 1911 and compared it with Buckle's *History of Civilization* and Gobineau's *Essay* for both its brilliance and suggestiveness as well as for its startling inaccuracies and lack of judgment. Roosevelt objected especially to Chamberlain's loose usage of the terms Aryan and Teuton. "He likes David, so he promptly makes him an Aryan Amorite. He likes Michelangelo, and Dante, and Leonardo, and he instantly says that they are Teutons; but he does not like Napoleon, and so he says that Napoleon is the true representative of the raceless chaos. . . . He greatly admires the teachings of the apostle Paul, and so he endeavors to persuade himself that the apostle Paul was not a Jew, but he does not like the teachings of the Epistle of James . . . and accordingly he says that James was a pure Jew."

Judged by present-day standards, Chamberlain's *Foundations* takes a place as one of the worst historical works ever published. Here dogmatism and rationalization were carried to extremes. The logic was cunningly forceful but imperfect; the author was entangled in his own mystic and romantic intuition; his arguments were sophistic, his conclusions impulsive. Chamberlain boasted that he was "incapable of lying." Yet, he was so overcome by the urge to prove the superiority of the Teutonic race that he lapsed into what he called "prophetic vision" and "historical intuition" to bolster his thesis.

Among the numerous contradictions was Chamberlain's treatment of pure races. He regarded "the sacredness of pure race" as an underlying theme of his work, yet at the same time he held that noble races evolve through intermixture and inbreeding. His statements of "fact" were appallingly inaccurate: Dante and Shakespeare were Teutons. The Teutons gave the world the idea of human liberty. Teutonism was responsible for Petrarch, Galileo, Leonardo, Michelangelo, in short, for the entire Renaissance. Nineteenth-century Germany was the home of Teutonic blood "in its greatest purity." The Jews were a "community of blood" dedicated to the mission of controlling the world and enslaving all non-Jews. "Christ did not have a single drop of genuinely Jewish blood in his veins."

This sort of irrationalism was destined to play a weighty role in German, European, and world history. Chamberlain's doctrines became a kind of secular religion giving psychic satisfaction to believers. Although nowhere in *Mein Kampf* did Hitler mention Chamberlain by name, it is clear that he imbibed Chamberlain's theories from second-hand sources. Konrad Heiden correctly classifies Hitler as an apostle of the apostles of Gobineau and Chamberlain (Hans F. K. Günther and Alfred Rosenberg). Directly or indirectly, Chamberlain prepared the way for the triumph of racialism in the Third Reich.

— 5 —

THE ANGLO-SAXON MYTH: THE WHITE MAN'S BURDEN

Racial Mysticism. In England the racialist myth took the form of an alleged uniformity of the Anglo-Saxon race. Social Darwinians, elaborating on the conclusions of physical anthropologists, began to describe the Anglo-Saxons as a distinct and pure race. It was seriously suggested that "the Teutonic invaders exterminated all the native inhabitants of England in a glorious universal slaughter." The so-called Anglo-Saxon race was endowed with special characteristics: language, religion, social habits were blended together and confused with race. While the *Mythus Teutonicus* flourished on the continent, racial mystics in the British Isles propounded the virtues of a non-existent "British race."

At first the racial argument had teleological overtones. God had created man unequal. This inequality had a purpose. Anglo-Saxons were obviously more intelligent than others (witness their success in imperialistic ventures), hence it was their task to give direction to other lesser races. A fine distinction was made between Englishmen and foreigners.

In building the cult of Anglo-Saxondom, scholars as well as pseudo-scholars were joined in a common purpose. Philologists, historians, publicists, poets, and politicians contributed to its construction. By the end of the nineteenth century, racialism had taken root in Britain.

Glorification of Teutonic Racial Strain. As early as 1841, Dr. Thomas Arnold (1795-1842), English clergyman and for a time headmaster of Rugby School, sketched out a racial theory in his inaugural lecture to the distinguished post of Regius Professor of Modern History at Oxford. Arnold had no great reputation as a scholar, but he, nevertheless, projected a racialist view that was to become increasingly popular. Charles Kingsley (1819-1875), clergyman, novelist, and amateur historian, popularized the idea of a Teutonic racial strain. In a series of lectures, *The Roman and the Teuton* (1864), Kingsley, comparing the Romans of the dying Empire with the "young and virile Teutonic forest children," intimated that the Germans had presented England with her most powerful racial strain.

This idea of a continuing racial strain from Teutonic to Anglo-Saxon was supported by a line of distinguished British historians. In 1849, John Mitchell Kemble (1807-1857), in his *History of the Saxons in England*, linked Anglo-Saxons and Teutons by race. Edward Augustus Freeman (1823-1892), Regius Professor of Modern History at Oxford, in his 15-volume *History of the Norman Conquest* (1867-1876), presented the theme of the permanence of Anglo-Saxon elements in English history despite the Norman Conquest. The Anglo-Saxons, he declared, were a gifted Teutonic people who gave England her free institutions. So earnestly did Freeman praise Teutonic elements in English history that he was dubbed by critics "the prince of Teutonists." Other British historians, including William Stubbs (1825-1901), Frederick W. Maitland (1850-1906), John Richard Green (1837-1883), James Anthony Froude (1818-1894), and Thomas Babington Macaulay (1800-1859) in one way or another bolstered the image of Englishmen as a great conquering race descended from vigorous Teutons. These scholars were first-rate historians, but, unfortunately, through loose utilization of racial terminology, they contributed, perhaps unconsciously, to the progress of racialism.

Thomas Carlyle's Racialism. A healthy boost for both British imperialism and racialism was given by Thomas Carlyle (1795-1881), Scottish-born English prose writer. Impressed and thrilled in his early career by Ger-

man literature and thought, especially Goethe and Schiller, Carlyle produced a long series of essays, biographies, and socio-political tracts, in most of which he revealed an intellectual love affair with Germanic idealist philosophy, moral intuition, and political institutions. If it were true that the British ruled the waves, the French the Continent, and the Germans the air, Carlyle preferred the vague generalities of the firmament in German dialect. He introduced the great-man theory of history, an accolade to the power of the individual, a theory nearly universally rejected today. His violent, savage style, marked by unusual expressions and figures of speech strongly affected by the Germanic tongue, attracted many readers and repelled even more.

In Carlyle's view, there was a close bond between Teuton and Englishman: "Just as Mycale was the Pan-Ionian, rendezvous of all the tribes of Ion, for old Greece, so must London long continue the All-Saxon home, rendezvous of all the 'Children of the Harz Rock.'" Carlyle believed it to be the great moral duty of England to extend the blessings of Anglo-Saxon civilization to all the backward races. "Our little Isle is grown too narrow for us, but the world is wide enough yet for another Six Thousand Years. . . . Our friends of China, who guiltily refuse to trade . . . had we not to argue with them, in cannon shot at last, and convince them that they ought to trade." He warned Englishmen to extend their influence by utilizing the methods of their Teutonic blood ancestors. He quoted Goethe:

Keep not standing fixed and rooted,
Briskly venture, briskly roam;
Head and hand, where'er thou foot it,
And stout hearts are still at home.

In what land, the sun does visit
Brisk are we, whate'er betide:
To give space, for wandering is it
That the world was made so wide.

To Carlyle, advocate of the aristocracy of race, the egalitarian formula of democracy was anathema. He wrote explosively of the sham and hypocrisy of democratic institutions, excoriated social legislation, and labeled the mechanism of the ballot box as dangerous (government must be entrusted to the wise, to "the seeing eye").

Carlyle's "Occasional Discourse on the Nigger Question," first published in *Fraser's Magazine* in 1849, was a notoriously bigoted statement of the case for the teleological view of race differences. In this piece, in flamboyant and arrogant terms, he sought to show that European whites were born more intelligent than Africans. He proposed a "Law of the World," in which he decreed that "the more foolish" must obey their superiors or both would pay the price in "futility and disappointment." It was an ill-tempered venture into rank racialism. (*See Reading No. 13.*)

Carlyle was not alone in presenting this type of dogmatism. Dr. Robert Knox (1791-1862), founder of British irrational racialism, violently attacked Negroes. He was disturbed lest civilization itself might be lost to a race which he regarded as physically strong but mentally feeble. He warned that the struggle for the tropical world was a matter of life and death. (*See Reading No. 14.*) Already Negroes had expelled the French from Haiti, and it appeared to Knox that they would work to prevent any white occupation of Africa. The uprising of the Xosa in South Africa, the Indian Mutiny, and the Maori wars, all occurring shortly after Knox's work, increased his racial suspicions.

"The White Man's Burden." In Victorian England there was dissatisfaction with Gladstonian liberalism, condemned for its emphasis on domestic matters and for its inglorious foreign policy. Benjamin Disraeli, Conservative Prime Minister elected in 1874, received vigorous popular support when he began to encourage British imperialism, a policy that was to be carried on by his successors, Joseph Chamberlain, Arthur James Balfour, and others.

An elaborate rationalization for Anglo-Saxon racial supremacy emerged in a complex of attitudes now known under Kipling's phrase, "the white man's burden." The main idea here was the belief that other races are different from Europeans and certainly inferior to them. Therefore, Anglo-Saxons, especially, have an obligation to the weak, black races, the same sort of obligation owed to women, children, and dumb animals—to all the weak.

Every black subject of the Queen would receive justice, but justice based on status. The weak, black races would be minor wards of the Empire, not citizens. The British Empire would be a great imperial organism precisely because of the superiority of the Anglo-Saxon race. At the time, the idea of a multi-racial Commonwealth was unthinkable.

Outstanding among the publicists who awakened British racial consciousness was a young nobleman, Sir Charles Wentworth Dilke (1843-1911). At the age of 23, Dilke made a voyage around the world, first visiting the United States, then New Zealand, Australia, Ceylon, India, and Egypt. He recorded his impressions in a travel book titled *Greater Britain* (1866-1867). His travels left him, he wrote, "with a conception, however imperfect, of the grandeur of our race, already girdling the world, which it is destined, perhaps, to overspread." The British, he said, were the only "extirpating race," a dominating race that would inevitably rule the backward colored races. (*See Reading No. 15.*)

In the United States, Dilke saw the triumph of the Anglo-Saxon race. "The true moral of America," he asserted, "is the vigour of the British race." Here, in the New World, the peoples of Europe are being fused together, but they are run into an English mold:

> Alfred's laws and Chaucer's tongue are theirs whether they would or not. There are men who say that Britain in her age will claim the glory of having planted greater Englands across the seas. They fail to perceive that she has done more than found plantations of her own—that she has imposed her institutions upon the offshoots of Germany, of Ireland, of Scandinavia, and of Spain. Through America, England is speaking to the world.
>
> Sketches of Saxondom may be of interest even upon humbler grounds: the development of the England of Elizabeth is to be found, not in the Britain of Victoria, but in half of the habitable globe.

In 1883, the historian Sir John Robert Seeley (1834-1895) published his *Expansion of England*, which presented a sinewy case for Anglo-Saxon racial supremacy. Seeley explained how and why England had gained her

colonies and India, the character of the Empire, and how it should be regarded by all Englishmen. He praised the Empire as the embodiment of Anglo-Saxon racial superiority and demanded that the British race awaken to its responsibilities and take action to maintain its rich heritage. (*See Reading No. 16.*)

British political leaders responsible for expansionism endorsed the Anglo-Saxon myth as well as the idea of the white man's burden. Once again we see the same confusion of the terms nation and race. "For my part," said Disraeli, "I do believe that . . . England is safe in the race of men who inhabit her." Joseph Chamberlain talked of the destiny of the British race. Lord Curzon used the word with slight regard for accurate meaning: "It is because I believe in the future of this country and the capacity of our own race to guide it to its goals that it has never hitherto attained, that I keep courage and press forward."

Arthur James Balfour was a bit more accurate, but still proudly Anglo-Saxon: "Although different streams have met together to make our kingdom and our Empire, none of them need feel that the difference destroys the unity of the stream which has resulted from their coalescence." Lord Rosebery, in an address before the Imperial Institute in 1898, gave the following justification for surrendering to racialism:

> I do not plead for the word Anglo-Saxon. I would welcome any other term than Anglo-Saxon which in a more conciliatory, a more scientific, and more adequate manner would describe the thing I want to describe. But whether you call it British or Anglo-Saxon, or whatever you call it, the fact is that the race is there. . . .
>
> This at least we may say, that when a nation has inhabited certain boundaries without disturbances, for a considerable number of centuries, even though it has received accessions from foreign nations, and when it has fused these accessions from foreign nations into its own nationality, and made them accept the name and language and laws and facts of that nationality, it seems to me for all practical purposes you have a nation and a race.

Rudyard Kipling, High Priest of Anglo-Saxon Cultism. By far the most important figure in fashioning the Anglo-Saxon myth was the patriot-poet Rudyard Kipling (1865-1936). In a life-long glorification of British imperialism and Anglo-Saxon racialism, Kipling repeatedly eulogized the great past and brilliant future of Britain. "The English," he exclaimed, "ah! the English—they are quite a race apart!" Millions, from country pubs to metropolitan hotels, solemnly agreed. "Truly," Kipling told his countrymen, "ye come of The Blood!" "The Blood" was vague, indeed, but it was, nevertheless, "the Blood." He was certain in a naïve way that inbred biological character was permanent, just as certain as biologists were uncertain. Inherited racial instincts, he warned, must not be quenched by the artificiality of modern civilization. He urged his countrymen to maintain the virility of their race. Native races, he declared, could never attain the high standards of the Anglo-Saxon.

Kipling originated the idea of "the white man's burden" and popularized it. The processes of nature, he believed, have led to the perfection of a great race of men—the Anglo-Saxons, whose duty it was to bring the benefits of civilization to backward races. But the races must be maintained in their proper places. "East is East and West is West and never the twain shall meet."

Critics denounced Kipling's racialism as "abounding in ignorant superstition and cheap philosophy." However, many Britons were captivated by his stories of swashbuckling British colonizers roaming through the lands of inferior races. One otherwise intelligent Briton was impressed: "Let us softly repeat to ourselves Mr. Kipling's alliterative lines, until a holy calm steals over us, and acts as a kind of natural sedative after our noble but nerve-upsetting mission of land-grabbing and money-spinning." Another Englishman put it this way, succinctly and accurately: "Kipling strikes chords within us, to which we are capable of vibrating sympathetically." Just about every Briton loved a Kipling parade.

The So-called Anglo-Saxon Race. There is no somatic uniformity in England. There is no Anglo-Saxon race. There is no British race. The Teutonic conquerors who came to Britain were merely an additional element

in the ethnic complex of the nation. In fact, the Teutons themselves were far from being ethnically homogeneous. The identification of the Anglo-Saxon race with the British nation may be dismissed as another aberration.

If there were a pure-blooded Englishman, how could he be described? Karl Pearson, British eugenist, undertook the task. Seldom has a more devastating blow been delivered at the idea of racialism:

> We are accustomed to speak of a typical Englishman. For example, Charles Darwin; we think of his mind as a typical English mind, working in the typical English manner, yet when we come to study his pedigree we seek in vain for 'purity of race.' He is descended in four different lines from Irish kinglets; he is descended in as many lines from Scottish and Pictish kings. He has Manx blood. He claims decent in at least three lines from Alfred the Great, and so links up with Anglo-Saxon blood, but he links up also in several lines with Charlemagne and the Carlovingians. He sprang also from the Saxon Emperors of Germany, as well as from Barbarossa and the Hohenstaufens. He has Norwegian blood and much Norman blood. He had descent from the Dukes of Bavaria, of Saxony, of Flanders, the Princes of Savoy, and Kings of Italy. He had the blood in his veins of Franks, Alemans, Merovingians, Burgundians, and Langobards. He sprang in direct descent from the Hun rulers of Hungary and Greek Emperors of Constantinople. If I recollect rightly, Ivan the Terrible provides a Russian link. There is probably not one of the races of Europe concerned in folk-wanderings which has not a share in the ancestry of Charles Darwin.*

* K. Pearson, "The Problems of Anthropology," *Scientific Monthly*, November, 1920, p. 455.

— 6 —

THE ALLEGED CELTIC RACE

The Celtic Myth. By no means did racialism confine itself to one people or limit itself to the boundaries of any one area. This kind of mythology infected most nations. The French were not immune. Celticism, a variant of Aryanism, asserted that the Celtic race, with its homeland in France and its main focus of dissemination in the Alpine highlands of midwestern Europe, has distinct somatic and psychic characteristics. It is, according to French racialists, superior among all the branches of the white race.

Before 1860, ethnologists, relying on the texts of classical writers, linked the early Celts with the tall, blond peoples of northern Europe. Julius Caesar had written in the *Commentaries* about the people of Gaul being divided into three parts—Belgae, Aquitani, and "those who in their own language are called Celts, in ours, Gauls." Though Caesar was not speaking of races, his statement was interpreted to mean that the Celts, or Gauls, were a distinct race.

In the decade following 1860, Pierre Paul Broca (1824-1880), French surgeon and cerebrologist, using his own anthropometric techniques, studied the physical characteristics of the French people. He found that the peasants of Brittany, the only Celtic-speaking people on the continent, were short and brunette. In 1865, Davis and Thurman found that a large part of the Celtic-speaking population of the British Isles, particularly the Welsh, were also short and dark-complexioned. These were inconvenient conclusions for racialists who believed the original Celts to be tall and blond.

In the 1870's German scholars began to study the ethnic character of the broad-headed, un-Teutonic population in the recesses of the Black Forest and the Alps.

Originally designated as Ligurian or Slavic types, these people were now identified as Celts mainly because they were dominantly short and of dark complexion and because Celtic place names seemed to be abundant in the area. In 1899 Ripley came to this weak conclusion: "Whatever be the present state of opinion among students of other cognate sciences, there is practically to-day a complete unanimity of opinion among physical anthropologists, that the term Celt, if used at all, belongs to the second of our three races—viz, the brachycephalic, darkish population of the Alpine highlands." (Ripley's three major European races were Teutonic, Celtic, and Mediterranean. *See Reading No. 3.*)

Interminable difficulties ensued. Philologists correctly used the term Celt to apply to all those speaking a Celtic tongue. But when anthropologists, archaeologists, and ethnologists began to assign the name Celt to all those who possessed Celtic culture, confusion was twice confounded. Some spoke of two distinct Celtic types—the tall, blond, dolichocephalic Celt (such as the Highland Scot and the people of northern Ireland), while others described the short, dark, brachycephalic Celt (the southern Irish). Added to the disorder was the existence in France of both blond, dolichocephalic Celts and short, dark, brachycephalic Celts.

The able Mexican anthropologist Juan Comas was skeptical: "Some schools of thought in France regard it as peopled by Celts, others by Gauls, though there is no agreement among French scholars as to which was which, nor whether they were or were not in fact the same race. Hence certain investigators hold that 'Celt' is a historical term of little scientific precision used to designate peoples speaking related languages and presenting every morphological variety from short, dark dolichocephalics through moderately fair brachycephalics of medium height to tall, blond dolichocephalics."

Celticism Versus Teutonism. French racialists split into two groups—advocates of Teutonism and of Celticism. The most zealous proponent of the Teutonic origins of Celticism was Count Arthur de Gobineau, who was sure that the Celtic (or Gallic) people of France had been subjected continually to the authority of the Germanic-

Teutonic element. A race of aristocratic Germans had conquered the Gallo-Romans. Where this Germanic element had never penetrated, Gobineau declared, our special kind of civilization does not exist. The Gobinian theory of history was characteristically simple: "Our civilization has been created by the mingling of the Germanic tribes with the races of the ancient world, the union, that is to say, of preëminently male groups with races and fragments clinging to the decayed remnants of ancient ideas." This sort of elaborate guesswork might be termed the sexual interpretation of history.

Gobineau further believed the Celtic peoples to represent a blend between white and yellow races, with a predominance of the former. This, of course, he felt to be highly undesirable. From his critical view, the Celtic race actually represented a weakening of the healthy Germanic-Teutonic-Aryan-Nordic strain. He gravely warned his countrymen that their blood must remain uncontaminated if France were to endure as a race of conquerors.

Advocates of Celticism denounced Gobineau and the Gobinians who dared hold views of Teutonic supremacy. The racial origin of the French people, they argued, was not Teutonic but Gallo-Roman. The leading apostle of the Celtic school was Numa Denis Fustel de Coulanges (1830-1889), Professor of Medieval History at the Sorbonne. In a series of studies, de Coulanges came to these conclusions: (1) the Germanic invasions were not violent and destructive in character; (2) the barbarian penetration of Gaul was a slow process; (3) the political institutions of the Merovingians owed more to Roman than to German law; (4) there was no conquest of Gaul by the Germans; and (5) the Teutonic *folkmoot* (early deliberative group) did not lead the way to Western liberty and democracy.

De Coulange's work was patriotism in action, a response to the defeat of France by Prussia in 1871. Others adopted a similar attitude. The historians Camille Jullian (1859-1933) and Edgar Quinet (1803-1875) and the philologist Marie Henri d'Arbois de Jubainville (1827-1910) began to minimize the importance of Teutonic influences on French history and to emphasize the corresponding importance of Gallo-Roman antecedents.

Celtic race theory went through four stages: (1) Germanic racial elements in France are relatively unimportant; (2) Teutonic institutions, as for example those in the Frankish state, had little influence when compared with the Gallo-Roman; (3) there was a blending of the genius of both Celtic and Teutonic strains; and (4) foreign influences have no validity in the presence of "pure Celtic blood" and superior Celtic institutions. Note how Celtic mythology, as all racial legendry, tended to become more absolute with the passage of time and further "research." By the end of the nineteenth century, many Frenchmen were convinced of the validity of the Celtic myth.

Maurice Barrès, Apostle of Celticism. Certainly the loudest of the French racialists was Auguste Maurice Barrès (1862-1923), novelist, nationalist, and patriot. Ignoring the heterogeneous ethnic composition of France, he assumed the existence of a pure Celtic race and warned his countrymen to maintain that racial purity: "Develop your instincts to the utmost; give satisfaction to your sensibilities; then you must obtain the perfection of your ego, and, therefore, you will not attentuate the purity of your race." In *Amori et Dolori Sanctum* (1903), Barrès spoke reverently of the ancestors whose noble blood now coursed in his own veins: "We are both the continuation and continuity of our fathers and mothers. It is not enough to say that the dead think and speak in us; the whole line of descendants constitute one single being."

Barrès, like Gobineau, was delighted by his own physical image. He regarded himself as the finest flower of the Celtic race. He believed that as an individual he represented a moment in the development of a race, "an instant in a long culture, a gesture among a thousand gestures." He reserved special praise for any Frenchman who was *"un homme plein de sa terre et sa race,"* a man who was filled with the essence of his soil and race. To maintain the purity of the Celtic race, he warned, it was necessary for all Frenchmen to oppose socialism or any doctrine aiming at "erasing the boundaries of race." Frenchmen must be aware of any racially degrading influ-

ences and must always feel within themselves "all the thousand and one strands of the past and the present which make us what we are." The mission of the Celtic race, he said solemnly, was close to the spirit of God.

To Barrès, the Jews were a disintegrative influence who had to be watched, an inferior race having only negative characteristics—no nobility, no mythology, no epic poetry, no philosophy, no science, no civil life. The Jews, he complained, worked by intellect, not by instinct.

To his compounding enemies Barrès added the Germans as a barbarian race who had always worked for the annihilation of French culture and ideas. He attacked Germans for suppressing French thoughts in the minds of the children of Metz and Strasbourg: "As a living spring may be hidden beneath faggots, she [Germany] attempts to conceal beneath German words a sensibility which for centuries nourished our race, and which the children received from their fathers."

Barrès's racialism, soil worship, and cult of the national soul stimulated similar attitudes in such patriotic Frenchmen as Paul Déroulède (1846-1914), playwright and politician, and in the two founders of the royalist journal *L'Action Française,* Léon Daudet (1867-1942) and Charles Maurras (1868-1952). However, Maurras's racialism was more a political weapon than an ideology. Wary of the idea of race (he denounced Gobineau as "inept, false, lying"), Maurras, nevertheless, believed that it furnished the basis for physical and moral observations that politics could utilize. Apparently, this was a French version of the old saw that in politics anything goes, even the discredited fables of racialism.

The French "Race." There is no French race. In France there are considerable numbers of every physical type to be found in Western Europe. Morphologically, the French people, like other peoples, have been and are an ethnic hodge-podge. In classifying his three main races of Europe, Ripley designated France as the meeting place of all three: (1) The Teutonic group (Normans, Franks, Saxons, Burgundians) is spread throughout the country; (2) the Celtic people makes up most of the population of Brittany and Savoy; and (3) the Mediterranean group

forms the basic stock of southern France. It is patently impossible to find any pure race in this conglomeration.

The process of intermingling proceeded throughout the course of French history. About 600 B.C. the Greeks penetrated France from Asia Minor, to be followed a century later by the Celts (or Gauls) from beyond the Rhine. Caesar conquered the disunited Gauls. Gauls and Romans then combined against the next invaders, the Germanic barbarians. Pushed westward by the migrating Huns, the barbarians finally surged into Gaul in the fifth century A.D. The Visigoths established themselves from the Loire to Andalusia; the Burgundians, originating in North Germany, settled along the Rhone; and the Franks, in two groups, Ripuarians and Salians, remained in northern Gaul.

By the Middle Ages, France was an ethnic amalgamation. When the medieval specialist, James Westfall Thompson, attempted to find some racial order in France, he came to some confusing conclusions: Under the later Carolingians the basic ethnic element was Gallo-Roman; the population in the northwest remained predominantly German; the Bretons in the northwest were "almost pure Celts"; the people in the region south of the Loire were predominantly Gallo-Roman; and the natives of the Provence and Mediterranean provinces were almost entirely Gallo-Roman.

In the modern era Ripley found an Alpine population in central France, a Teutonic people in the fertile axis along the River Rhone, and broad-headed racial types in three geographically, culturally and socially isolated areas —Savoy, east of the Rhone; Auvergne (the Massif Centrale); and Brittany. "Thus, there are, broadly speaking, long-headed populations in the two fertile axes, and broad-headed Alpines in the areas of isolation."

Again we see the frustrating effects of confusing race with language or nation. When French racialists affirm that France is a country of brachycephalic Celts and that this strain is superior to the dolichocephalic German Nordics, they merely express nationalistic sentiment. The Celtic myth, motivated politically, has no validity.

— 7 —

THE NEGRO RACE

The Nature of Color Prejudice. Racialists attach special importance to the color of the skin. Although aware that the colored races make up approximately three-fifths of the world's population, they believe that this large proportion of mankind should be relegated to a subordinate status. They condemn the Negro, especially, to contempt and a low social position. The Negro, they assert, is inferior biologically and mentally, and this situation cannot be altered because of the permanence of racial character. To the racialist "the leopard cannot change his spots, nor the Ethiopian his skin."

Behind color prejudice against the Negro was a long tradition of literary justification by both famous and infamous bigots. The classic expression was made by Thomas Carlyle in his "Occasional Discourse on the Nigger Question," in which he claimed that white men were born wiser than Negroes. (*See Reading No. 13.*)

In the United States of the 1840's and 1850's, there was a bitter intellectual battle about the place of the Negro in American society, a cold war that was to merge eventually into the tragic Civil War. American tradition had stressed the idea of equality. John Locke, apostle of natural rights, stated that "creatures of the same species and rank, . . . born to all the same advantages of nature, and the use of the same faculties, should also be equal one amongst another without subordination or subjection." This was expressed in the "self-evident truth" of the Declaration of Independence "that all men are created equal." Nevertheless, there ensued a harsh struggle on the issue of the place of the Negro in American society.

In the United States, as elsewhere, it was believed that only science could solve the dilemma as to whether the

races sprang from one creation or many. Among the scientists who confused the issue further was Dr. Samuel George Morton (1799-1851), a Philadelphia physician and professor of anatomy. According to Morton, the brain of the five races of man—Caucasian, Mongolian, Malay, American, and Negro—was "successively smaller in each." The white race, he said, has "a decided and unquestionable superiority over all the nations of the earth." George R. Gliddon (1809-1857), an English-born lecturer on Egyptology, stoutly insisted that the Egyptians were not mixed Negro-white, that the races were distinct even at the early date of Egyptian civilization, and that the passing centuries had not "whitened the Negro, or darkened the Caucasian, from their primitive types." Dr. Josiah Clark Nott (1804-1873), a physician of Mobile, Alabama, and one of the founders of the "American School" of anthropology, listed these anatomical differences: the Negro has larger nerves, head of a different shape, a small brain and facial angle, and "intellectual powers comparatively defective."

In 1843, the Rev. Josiah Priest (1788-1851) published in Albany, New York, a book titled *Slavery as it Relates to the Negro, or African Race,* in which he attempted to prove that the Negro was inherently inferior to the white man. In 1851, the fifth edition of this book was published in Glasgow, Kentucky, under the title *Bible Defense of Slavery; and Origins, Fortunes, and History of the Negro.*

Little wonder, then, that the Southern statesman, John C. Calhoun (1782-1850), could describe slavery as a blessing to master and slave alike. In the free states, he charged, the condition of the African, instead of being improved, had become worse. "There, Negroes invariably sank into vice and pauperism, accompanied by the bodily and mental afflictions incident thereto—deafness, blindness, insanity and idiocy—to a degree without example." In the slave states, he said, Negroes had "improved greatly in every respect—in numbers, comfort, intelligence, and morals." Slavery, he concluded, was necessary to preserve the Negro race.

From Calhoun's time to the present day, racialists followed a similar line in their attitude toward the Negro race. There was a pattern in the argument. Physically, the

Negro is strong. His arms and legs are long in proportion to his trunk, whereas the limbs of whites are relatively short. Marked Negro prognathism—the jaws projecting beyond the upper part of the face—indicates a primitive somatic trait, it is asserted, and is proof of biological inferiority. Negroes have "racially" adapted themselves to climate. Nature (or God) has placed the black man in the tropics because his physical structure is such that he can withstand the warm and humid climate, whereas whites weaken in the unfamiliar environment. The Negro, it is stated, is resistant to malaria or yellow fever, while the white man is not; paradoxically, this is presented as further proof of Negro racial inferiority.

The racialist view holds, furthermore, that, whereas the Negro is physically strong, he is mentally feeble. Negroes, it is said, are a childlike race and must be kept in subjugation and directed for their own good. White superiority must be maintained as a badge of civilization. "No pure-blooded Negro has ever risen above the grade of mediocrity in the whites." Mongolians have risen a few steps in civilization, but the Negroes "have risen but little above the beasts of the field." The lack of Negro intelligence, it is charged, is due to heredity, to innate factors, and cannot be changed any more than skin color can be altered. Do not psychological tests indicate the mental inferiority of Negroes?

Along with such views came these conclusions:

(1) The Negro race has had a relatively slow political, economic, and cultural evolution because of its inborn inferiority.

(2) The Negro is endowed by nature with a placid, easy-going disposition so that he can work more effectively under the direction of the superior whites.

(3) The Negro is virtually another species, "subhuman" in both biological and mental character.

(4) It is difficult enough for the white races to maintain rational government; what would become of our institutions in the hands of Negroes?

Defense of the Negro Race. The racialist position on Negroes was attacked by a large number of scholars as without the slightest justification. Anti-racialists contend

that there is no proof of the allegation of Negro inferiority. The fact of social and cultural backwardness, it is affirmed, has been confused with racial inferiority. The lower level of Negro life is attributed by this school to unfavorable politico–economic and environmental factors, certainly not to innate somatic or mental characteristics.

To the racialist claim that prognathism, or the degree of protrusion of the jaws, is a sign of primitiveness in the Negro race, anti-racialists counter that other somatic characteristics do not follow the same pattern. What about lack of body hair and texture of the hair, both of which in the Negro indicate a more advanced stage of evolution than in the white man?

Similarly, anti-racialists reject the charge that the cranial capacity of the Negro is smaller than that of the white man. They point to the investigations of scientists (Huxley, Keith, Sergi) which demonstrated that: (1) There are no significant racial differences between blacks and whites in the size or weight of the brain; (2) the weight of the frontal lobe, regarded as the seat of intelligence, is 44% of the total weight of the brain in *both* whites and blacks; (3) there are variations in size and weight of the brain in all races. According to anti-racialists, the "evidence" presented by racialists is worthless and results from confusing environment and group ethics with racial character.

The contention that intelligence tests indicate the mental inferiority of Negroes was vigorously attacked by Otto Klineberg, Professor of Psychology at Columbia University. (*See Reading No. 17.*) Klineberg came to the conclusion that intelligence tests in themselves do not enable us to differentiate safely between what is attributable to innate capacity and what is the result of environmental influences, training, and education. As opportunities for racial groups become more alike, the differences in test results tend to disappear. Therefore, race, in Klineberg's view, is not a factor determining the level of intelligence.

Doubts about Negro inferiority on a racial basis began to arise as a result of psychological testing in World War I. Those examined were rated by being assigned grades lettered from A to E. The results are shown in Table 3.

Table 3 *Results of Psychological Testing in World War I*

Group and Number of Individuals	Grades (by Percentage) Below C	C	Above C
Englishmen, 411	9	71	20
White draft generally, 93,973	24	64	12
Italians, 4007	63	36	1
Poles, 382	70	30	(0.5)
Negroes generally, 18,891	79	20	1

On first glance these figures apparently show a racial difference between Negroes and whites in intelligence. Note that the Negro seems to be lowest of all in the ratings. But an important qualifying factor is present: the Italians and Poles, both of the white race, stand closer to the Negroes than to the white Americans generally. Clearly, there is something wrong with these figures—at least in their interpretation.

Additional tests were made to distinguish between the scores of northern and southern Negroes. Here the northern Negro easily surpassed the Italian in America. (See Table 4.) Apparently, such psychological testing proved more about educational opportunity than about race.

Table 4 *Comparative Scores of Northern and Southern Negroes*

Group and Number of Individuals	Grades (by Percentage) Below C	C	Above C
Negroes, 5 northern states, 4,705	46	51	3
Italians, 4,007	63	36	1
Negroes, 4 southern states	86	14	(0.3)

In another series of tests, Negroes from some of the northern states proved to be superior mentally to the whites from some of the southern states. The early tests in the Army had been used for reasonably literate people who spoke English (*Alpha test*). A second set of tests (*Beta*) was devised for those obviously ineligible for the old style. The results are shown in Table 5.

Table 5 *Alpha Test: Literates*

Group and Number of Individuals	Grades (by Percentage) Below C	C	Above C
Englishmen—374	5	74	21
White draft generally—72,618	16	69	15
Alabama whites—697	19	72	9
New York Negroes—1,021	21	72	7
Italians—575	33	64	3
Negroes generally—5,681	54	44	2
Alabama Negroes—262	56	44	(0.4)
Beta Test: Illiterates			
White draft generally—26,012	58	41	1
Italians—2,888	64	35	1
New York Negroes—440	72	28	1
Poles—263	76	24	0
Alabama whites—384	80	20	(0.4)
Negroes generally—11,633	91	9	(0.2)
Alabama Negroes—1,043	97	3	(0.1)

Note that in these figures the New York Negroes were nearly at the same level as the Alabama whites among literates, and ahead of them among the illiterates. The literate Negroes of the draft, regardless of their geographical section, surpassed the illiterate whites. Most psychologists were convinced, as a result of these tests, that color of skin was far less important than education, cultural advantage, improved earning capacity, incentive—in short, social environment—in determining success with the tests.

The tests were not final nor conclusive. But they did provide an opportunity to refute many arguments of the racialists. The latter attacked the results as egalitarian nonsense and as an overused "liberal" weapon. Some scholars took a neutral position: For example, the anthropologist A. L. Kroeber wrote: "It is possible that some of the differences between sectionally and educationally equalized groups of whites and Negroes is really innate and racial. But it is also possible that most or all of it is environmental. Neither possibility can be demonstrated from the unrefined data at present available."

The Garrett Thesis. The debate on the quality of the Negro and white races was protracted and bitter. It still

goes on. A new round opened in the summer of 1961 when a nationally known psychologist, Henry E. Garrett, published an article in *Perspectives in Biology and Medicine,* in which he contended that the "equalitarian dogma" holding Negroes to be the mental equals of whites was "the scientific hoax of the century." (*See Reading No. 18.*) The article might have received little attention had its author been a neophyte scholar or an inexperienced scientist, but Garrett, Visiting Professor of Psychology at the University of Virginia, was formerly the head of the Department of Psychology at Columbia University and a past President of the American Psychological Association.

Garrett charged that the equalitarian (or egalitarian) dogma—which holds that, except for environmental differences, all races are potentially equal—was widely accepted by "sincere humanitarians, social reformers, crusaders, sentimentalists—and ostensibly—politicians." From two directions—social scientists and religious groups—there has been, for thirty years, an intense and self-righteous propaganda barrage for the equalitarian dogma. "Budding young scientists of independent mind jeopardize their careers by challenging the dogma." Five sources, Garrett charged, have stimulated the propaganda barrage: "modern" anthropology, Hitler and the Nazis, African nationalism, the Supreme Court decision of 1954 on desegregation, and the Communists.

In his attack on "modern" anthropology, Garrett denounced the work of Franz Boas, "father of the equalitarian movement," who made the most potent assault on native racial differences. The conclusions of cultural anthropologists on comparative abilities of racial groups, according to Garrett, "are often subjective and unconvincing." Apparently rejecting the World War I psychological tests, Garrett quoted a recent study to show that the I.Q.'s of American Negroes are from 15 to 20 points, on the average, below those of American whites.

To Garrett the idea that men are born equally endowed is emotional and deceptive. "In the several thousand years of recorded history, the black African has never constructed an alphabet, created a literature or a science, produced any great men, or built up a civilization. Toynbee, the eminent British historian, has written that of the 21 great civilizations of the past, not one has been Negro."

Garrett concluded that the equalitarian dogma, therefore, represents a sincere but misguided effort to help the Negro "by ignoring or even suppressing evidence of his mental and social immaturity."

Garrett was defended by zealous racialists who contended:

(1) The concept of the equality or similarity of all men and the current belief in the omnipotence of social influences is fallacious;

(2) If it be true that all races have the same innate capacity for intellectual development, then why is it that so far only the members of the white race have built up any scientific knowledge?

(3) A white man would not be prepared to marry his daughter to an African aboriginal.

At this time there was a trend toward seeking justification for segregation (social and educational separation of whites and Negroes). In November 1961, John Patterson, Governor of Alabama, who ran on a strong segregation platform, hired Dr. Wesley Critz George, a North Carolina geneticist, to determine "significant scientific differences" between whites and Negroes. In a preliminary statement, Dr. George gave hints on the outcome of his study: "I would be happy to think that the facts in the case justify our disregarding race. But they do not. Racial amalgamation will not do the world any good."

That same month, on November 20, 1961, the council of the American Anthropological Association considered a resolution introduced by Professor Gordon R. Willey of Harvard University as a basic statement of its position on the race question. The resolution, adopted by a vote of 192 to 0, stated:

> The American Anthropological Association repudiates statements now appearing in the United States that Negroes are biologically and in innate mental ability inferior to whites, and reaffirms the fact that there is no scientifically established evidence to justify the exclusion of any race from the rights guaranteed by the Constitution of the United States. The basic principles of equality of opportunity and equality before the law are compatible with all that is known about human biology. All races possess the abilities needed to participate fully in the democratic way of life and in modern technological civilization.

— 8 —

THE JEWISH MYTH AND ANTI-SEMITISM

The Idea of a Jewish Race. One of the most commonly misused terms in our language is "the Jewish race." Racialists set the Jews apart as a distinct race that has preserved its purity since the taking of Jerusalem by Titus in 70 A.D. Along with this premise goes a series of charges: the Jews are a peculiar people who possess such innate racial traits as acquisitiveness, deceitfulness, cultural backwardness, and selfishness, and who act as a disintegrative element in any society. Hilaire Belloc, British writer, expressed a common resentment: "We know a horse to be a horse, an apple to be an apple, a Chinaman to be a Chinaman, or a Jew to be a Jew!" And Madison Grant, American writer, presented this view: "The cross between a white man and an Indian is an Indian; the cross between a white man and a Negro is a Negro; the cross between a white man and a Hindu is a Hindu; and a cross between any of these European races and a Jew is a Jew."

The Test of Somatic Characteristics. The grouping of Jews as a distinct race has no scientific validity. (*See Reading No. 19,* in which the Harvard physical anthropologist, Carl C. Seltzer, denies that there is a Jewish race.)

Let us apply the tests generally used to distinguish between the races. There is no typical head form among Jews scattered throughout the world. There is as great a variation in the cephalic index of Jews, *i.e.,* from 65 to 98, as will be found in mankind. The cephalic index of Jews differs along with local populations: in Baden, in pre-Hitler Germany, it was 88.6 (Ammon); in Frankfurt-

am-Main, from 73.8 to 88.6 (Weissenberg); in Spain, 78.1 (Weissenberg); in Central Asia, 82.5 (Weissenberg); in Persia, 79.8; on the Barbary Coast, 74 (Bertholon and Chantre); in Morocco, 75.92, and in Tunisia, 76.11 (Fishberg); in Turkey, 76; in the Caucasus, 87; in the United States, 81.

Juan Comas comments that Jews of Spanish origin have dolichocephalic skulls, while Russian Jews are brachycephalic; the head formation of each group resembles the people among whom they live. A study of the cranial measurements of English Jews showed that 28.3% were dolichocephalic, 24.3% mesocephalic, and 47.4% brachycephalic. Jews in Asia are predominantly brachycephalic, in Africa they are mostly dolichocephalic, and in Europe generally they are represented by all three cephalic types. In his study of Polish-Jewish school children in New York City, Franz Boas found that better climate, a higher standard of living, more nourishing food, and a more stable mode of life led to physical changes—including even head form—after the first generation. (*See Reading No. 6.*)

Equally variable are other somatic characteristics. It is often assumed that Jews are always dark-haired, but this is incorrect. The Jews of North Africa, Italy, and the Near East, where the majority of the people are brunette, are also dark-haired. M. Fishberg found that 67% of Jews have straight, 26% wavy, only 6% curly and 1% woolly, fuzzy hair. Further, his researches showed that 60% of the Jews in southwestern Germany, 25% in Galicia, and more than 11% in America were blond. Other investigations found 49% of Polish Jews light-haired and 51% dark-haired.

The so-called hooked nose is sometimes regarded as typically Jewish. Yet, the proportion of "Jewish noses" among non-Jews of the world is higher than among Jews. In a survey of 2,836 adult male Jews in New York City, Fishberg found these varying types of noses: straight (Greek) 57.26%; retroussé (snub) 22.07%; aquiline (hooked) 14.25%; flat and broad 6.42%. Dixon commented that in Slavic countries, where the retroussé nose is common, the Jews, too, possess such noses.

The attempt to set the Jews apart physically as a dis-

tinct race includes claims that Jews are more fertile than other peoples (circumcision is said to be practised for this purpose), that Jewish girls begin menstruation earlier than Gentiles, and that Jews are peculiarly susceptible to such diseases as tuberculosis and diabetes. We need not belabor the point, nor is it possible to present here any more than a token argument to show the variability of somatic characteristics of the so-called Jewish race. Systematic anthropological investigations indicate that ethnically the Jews, like other groups of human beings, are a mixed people who nearly always reflect the physical character of those among whom they live. The homogeneous Jewish type exists only in the imagination of racialists.

According to Fishberg: "The percentage of light-eyed blonds and their irregular distribution in the various centers of Jewish population, the extreme variability of the cranial index—at least as great as that observable between any of the peoples of Europe, the existence among Jews of Negroid, Mongoloid, and Teutonic types, the variations in stature, etc., are other proofs of the nonexistence of one Semitic race unmodified since Biblical times."

To this R. N. Salaman adds: "The purity of the Jewish race is imaginary; the widest variety of ethnic types is found among Jews, ranging, as regards cranial conformation only, from brachycephalics to hyperdolichocephalics. More particularly in Germany and Russia, there are Jews who do not display the smallest Semitic characteristics."

The Historical Evidence. Who, then, are the Jews? This is the answer of the anthropologist A. L. Kroeber: "The Jews, who were once a nationality, at present, of course, form a religious body, which somewhat variably, in part from inner cohesion and in part from outer pressure, tend also to constitute a caste. They evince little hereditary type."

The history of the Jews is well known. In the formative period, nomadic, pastoral tribes who spoke Semitic languages emigrated from the desert border of southern Mesopotamia and followed the fringes of civilization around the Fertile Crescent to Palestine. Then followed the familiar development: the move into Egypt, bondage, the exodus, and return to Palestine; the period of the

Judges and the emergence of the Jews as a nation with the Kingdom of Israel under Saul; the golden days of David and Solomon; the division of the people into the Kingdom of Judah and the Kingdom of the Ten Tribes; the era of the Prophets and the destruction of the Temple in 586 B.C. The early nomadic pastoral tribes were probably of Mediterranean stock, a sub-race of the white division of mankind, similar to the Arabs and Mesopotamians of the area. Even during this formative period of their history the Jews mingled ethnically with Iranian Plateau and Alpine types.

This Mediterranean-Iranian Plateau-Alpine admixture continued during the next historical period. The Jews were held in captivity in Babylon from 586 to 538 B.C. Those who returned founded a new community in Judea. Then came the age of the prophets Ezra and Nehemiah, the Egyptian relationships, the Hellenistic period, the rise of the Maccabees, the Roman era, the rise of Christianity, and the destruction of the Temple in 70 A.D. by the Roman Titus. There was much intermixture with Egyptian blood during this period, and, with the expansion of Hellenism, were added Alpine and Nordic elements. By the time of the second destruction of the Temple, the Jews formed a composite racial stock, basically Mediterranean, with evidences of the "hooked-nose" Iranian Plateau element, and with the addition of Alpine and Nordic strains. Most Western European Jews were ultimately derived from this intermingled stock.

There is little racial homogeneity left in the three major groups of Jews. In Spain since the beginning of the Christian era, there was an important Jewish colony which had followed the Romans westward from Palestine. These Sephardic Jews were driven out of Spain along with the Arabs about 1492 A.D. and then dispersed to Holland, England, Italy, North Africa, and the Balkans. The bulk of modern European and American Jewry is composed of the Ashkenazic type, whose composite of physical features indicates a heterogeneous ethnic background. The third major group, the Oriental Jews, including the Persian Jews and the Bokharan Jews of Russian Turkestan, intermingled with Persians, Turkish, and Mongol peoples, many of whose physical characteristics they acquired.

Even if the Jews were originally a pure race, which cannot be proved or disproved, there has been an extensive crossing with other peoples from antiquity to the present day. Their history reveals them to be a religious body, not a distinct race. They have taken on the physical character of the people among whom they live. There are Jews with dark and light hair, with straight and aquiline noses, with short and tall stature, with long narrow heads and short broad heads. According to Juan Comas: "The fact that some Jews can be identified as such on sight is due less to inherited physical traits than to the conditioning of emotional and other reactions productive of distinctive facial expressions and corporal attitudes, mannerisms, intonation and tendencies of temperament and character, by Jewish custom and the treatment inflicted on Jews by non-Jews."

Racialism and Anti-Semitism. Throughout their history the Jews have aroused hostility in the people among whom they lived. In ancient and medieval eras this antagonism was more precisely anti-Judaism, partly religious and partly economic in nature. Later, however, anti-Semitism became a social and political attitude, infecting whole countries or great sections of the population. The outbursts are familiar—the pogroms of Jews in Eastern and Central Europe; the Dreyfus case in France, in which a Jewish officer was falsely accused of selling military secrets to the Germans; the world-wide dissemination of the spurious *Protocols of the Elders of Zion;* and the translation of anti-Semitic theory into genocide by Adolf Hitler and the Nazis, who slaughtered 6,000,000 Jews in an attempt to purge the world of "Jewish blood." Conscious or unconscious racialists, including many in the latter category, speak of the "destructive spirit" of the Jews as if every Jew carried within himself a means of threatening the stability of society.

In the nineteenth century, anti-Semitism and racialism merged into one movement. The hatred for Jews that previously had been grounded on religious motives now sought justification in racial theory. The myth of a Jewish race was compounded in an attempt to provide a "scientific" cloak for politico-economic attacks. The xenophobic concept of the Jews as an outside racial group gathered

strength in Europe. Thousands of books and pamphlets were written to prove that the Jew was a cosmopolitan without national loyalty, that he possessed a shrewdness and selfishness that made him the master of the honest Aryan, and that he was "a cancer slowly eating into the flesh of other races." The Jew, it was said, hated other peoples. He was clannish. He had a body odor that was definitely racial.

Anti-Semitism, especially virulent in Germany, had behind it generations of accumulating hatred. As early as the 1840's, Christian Lassen proclaimed this verdict: "History proves Semites do not possess the harmony of psychical forces which distinguishes the Aryan. The Semite is selfish and exclusive. He possesses a sharp intellect which enables him to make use of the opportunities created by others."

When the New Industrial Revolution began to take effect in mid-nineteenth-century Germany, the Jews were accused of being responsible both for the excesses of the new capitalism and for the ideology of the rising Social Democracy. Heinrich von Treitschke (1834-1896), leading German historian, insisted that "the Jews are our misfortune!" (*See Reading No. 20.*) Jews were assaulted on the streets of major German cities. Jewish merchants were boycotted. Anti-Semitic meetings were held throughout Germany. Racial anti-Semitism, flaring up in virulent form, became an organized political and social movement.

A gradual hardening of racial prejudice occurred in the nineteenth century. There was some toleration of the Jews as a result of the democratic and humanitarian ideas of the French Revolution expressed in the formula "liberty, equality, fraternity." By 1870, however, in a desperate search for allies to support a waning power, political leaders turned to racialism—specifically, anti-Semitism—as a useful propaganda device. Weak remnants of religious antagonisms were seized upon and inflated with racialism. The Jews, as a minority group, appeared to be the perfect scapegoat for socio-economic ills, especially in Germany, Austria, and Russia.

— 9 —

RACIALISM IN THE THIRD REICH

Nazi Racialism. Racialism in Nazi Germany was something more than a simple matter of the blond German superman pitted against the dark-haired non-Nordic. It was a more subtle ideology calling for purification of the Aryan-Nordic-Teutonic race and the introduction of a "super-race" by purging Germany of all "corrupting racial elements." For the first time in history, genocide—the slaughter of an entire people—became the established policy of a civilized nation. Millions of Jews and other "racial undesirables" were sacrificed to Hitler's fanaticism.

Precursors of Nazi Race Theories. Hitlerite racialism was an amalgam of fiction and fact, of theory and nonsense. There was a fruitful soil in which racialism could grow. Count Arthur de Gobineau and Houston Stewart Chamberlain were the forerunners of Hitler's views on racial philosophy.

Others made significant contributions to Nazi racialism, notably a group of anthropo-sociologists whose minute measurements and detailed statistical data satisfied undemanding minds. The most productive of these scholars was Otto Ammon (1842-1916). The skulls of creative men, said Ammon, are almost always dolichocephalic, or long-headed. As evidence of the superiority of the German Nordic race, Ammon cited the German love for cycling and the Teutonic compassion for the weak and friendless. Another German anthropo-sociologist, Ludwig Woltmann (1871-1907), sought to prove by a comparative study of portraits that many great Italians were in fact Germans. He designated Giordano Bruno as Braun; Giotto as Jothe; Leonardo da Vinci as Wincke.

Richard Wagner (1813-1883), the great German composer, was especially influential in moulding Hitler's race

theories. In both his music and writings Wagner sought to express what he termed the German Hero-Spirit, a quality he believed to be possessed only by those of Nordic blood. The German Spirit, he announced, was innate; it distinguished the German people from all others. He was sure that, against this biologically engrained combination of mind, spirit, and physique, such lower civilizations as the French could not prevail. German nobility, according to Wagner, was a gift of the all-powerful force of heredity, which kept German blood pure and uncontaminated. (*See Reading No. 21.*)

Adolf Stoecker (1835-1909), German court-chaplain, who founded the Christian Socialist Workers' Party in 1874, proclaimed that German blood flows in every German body, and the soul is found in the blood (*und im Blut ist die Seele*). When one has a German brother before him, Stoecker said, there takes place a certain reaction that never occurs if the other person happens not to be German. Stoecker attacked the Jews as a nation within the nation, a state within the state, and a race in the midst of another race. In one of his rabble-rousing speeches he shouted: "Ladies and Gentlemen: Recently a body was found in the vicinity. It was examined. Present were the Jewish town physician, a Jewish doctor, a Jewish coroner, a Jewish lawyer—only the body was German! . . . We don't want this to be the fate of Berlin and the fate of all great cities!" Stoecker's diatribes impressed many Germans. When he tried to export his version of Christian Socialism to England, however, he was promptly laughed out of the country.

Hitlerian Racialism. Racialism was not exclusively German, but in Germany it found a receptive soil. Adolf Hitler, and the theorists who helped him, looked back to earlier racial thinking and appropriated what they found of value.

Racialist ideology was given a powerful stimulus by Hitler's *Mein Kampf*. In stormy, violent, and sometimes vulgar prose, Hitler presented his version of the basic elements of racial theory. The human race, he wrote, consists of three categories—*founders, maintainers, and destroyers of culture*. The Aryan (read Nordic) race represents the first two categories (founders and maintain-

ers), the Jews the third (destroyers). The Germans must unite racially for a struggle to the death between Nordic and Jewish races, for history has shown "with terrible clarity" how each time Nordic blood has become mixed with that of inferior peoples the result has been the end of the culture-sustaining race. Bastardization of the German race must be avoided as the plague. (*See Reading No. 22.*)

The philosophical *Fuehrer* of Nazi intellectualism was Alfred Rosenberg (1893-1946). Moody, maudlin, egocentric, Rosenberg wrote *The Myth of the Twentieth Century* (1930), in effect a re-statement of the familiar Gobineau-Chamberlain thesis of race superiority. (*See Reading No. 23.*) Rosenberg's first concern was to give what he called a scientific justification for the Nazi blood myth. "The *Mythus* is the Mythus of the Blood, which, under the sign of the Swastika, released the World Revolution. It is the Awakening of the Soul of the Race, which, after a period of long slumber, victoriously put an end to racial chaos." The real Christ, said Rosenberg, was an Amorite Nordic, aggressive, courageous, a man of true Nordic character, a revolutionist who opposed the Jewish and Roman systems with sword in hand, bringing not peace but war. The remainder of the book is on the same or even a lower level of scholarship.

Hans F. K. Günther, Friedrich Lenz, Eugen Fischer, and others, in a series of publications which received enormous circulation in Hitler's Germany, glorified Aryan-Nordics as great bearers of virtue and as leaders of civilization. German youth, said Günther, must find Nordic mates if the Nordic race were not to perish. It must always seek models in the old Germanic world, "which was an unsullied expression of the Nordic nature." Other German racialists wrote in similar style. (*See Reading No. 24.*)

During the campaign for racial purification, a huge literature on racialism appeared in Nazi Germany. Hermann Gauch re-classified the animal world into two categories—Nordic men and lower animals (Jews). (*See Reading No. 25.*) Professor Wolfgang Kruse of Königsberg University found the "true and original meaning" of Aryan to be "superior person." Hermann Goering, No. 2

Nazi, affirmed that "true leaders are born from blood and soil and have no need of culture and science." Dr. Joseph Goebbels, Hitler's propaganda minister, attacked the Jews as a race in scathing terms: "The Jew is a man but what sort of man? The flea is also an animal!"

The theory of Nazi racialism received practical application in the Nuremberg Laws of 1935. Citizenship was granted to "all subjects of German or kindred blood." Anyone who possessed one full-blooded Jewish grandparent was classified as belonging to the Jewish race. Marriage was forbidden between Christians and Jews. Jews were eliminated from the political, economic, and cultural life of Germany. With these laws, racialism, which until this time had been a vague and intangible ideology, became for the first time in history the legal basis for a modern state. (*See Reading No. 26.*)

The bankruptcy of Nazi racial metaphysics was indicated by the fact that eventually what was Aryan or non-Aryan was determined not by definition, but only by Hitler's intuition. On various occasions Hitler proclaimed the Finns, the Arabs, and the Japanese to be Aryans. He designated the Japanese as "honorary Aryans," presumably because they revealed the aggressiveness he assumed to be typical of the "Aryan race."

What is the historical meaning of Nazi racialism? Otto Klineberg presented these results of Nazi racial theory and its practice: First, it helped unify the Germans. Second, it gave the Germans a strong feeling of ego-enhancement, of increased status, and self-confidence. Third, there were obvious economic gains. Finally, racialism prepared the way for aggressive war and justified the extension of war.

Racialism was a powerful weapon used by Hitler and the Nazis to achieve and maintain power. It also helped to drag a great nation down to the lowest level in its history. Suffused with irrationalism, mythology, and fanaticism, it meant the intellectual bankruptcy of a people. George Bernard Shaw gave it an appropriate description —Nazi racialist ideology, he said, was simply "pernicious nonsense."

— 10 —

RACIALISM IN THE UNITED STATES

Background: The Historians. The Anglo-Saxon myth and its concomitant Aryan-Nordic ideal were presented in the United States as "prophylactics against an immediate danger to mankind." Spreading the fear of racial degeneration, alarmists warned Americans that their high civilization was doomed to destruction unless the American "race" be uncontaminated. They denounced as "liberal propaganda" the contention that the American nation was composed of a variety of ethnic strains and that no pure races were left in the American melting pot.

Racialism in the United States in the 1840's and 1850's was closely bound with the issue of slavery. It was important for racialists to show that the Negro was intellectually inferior to the white man. (*See Chapter 7.*)

After the Civil War, racialism was promoted, at times unconsciously, by a group of historians who emphasized the Teutonic origins of American institutions. Herbert Baxter Adams (1850-1901), pointed to the Germanic origins of New England towns, as well as to the continuity of Anglo-Saxon institutions in America. John W. Burgess (1844-1931) asserted that of all peoples who had learned Darwin's lesson of the survival of the fittest, the Teutonic race was the only one of superior stock. In his view, the Anglo-Saxon race, closely related biologically to Germanic stock, was the leader in the establishment and administration of state forms. According to Burgess, there was "a vast difference in political capacity between races," and it was "the white man's mission, his duty and his right, to hold the reins of political power in his own hands for the civilization of the world and the welfare of man-

kind." Imperialism, he said, was a laudable movement because it reflected the human desire to extend the civilizing force to the barbaric races.

In an article written in 1885 and titled "Manifest Destiny," John Fiske (1842-1901) prophesied that the day would come "when four-fifths of the human race will trace its pedigree to English forefathers, as four-fifths of the white people of the United States trace their pedigree today." In that same year, 1885, Josiah Strong (1847-1916), a Congregationalist clergyman, published a popular book in which he portrayed the Anglo-Saxon race as the most vital force on earth because it had brought with it the ideas of civil liberty and spiritual Christianity. (*See Reading No. 27.*) "If I read not amiss," he wrote, "this powerful race will move down upon Mexico, down upon Central and South America, out upon the islands on the sea, over upon Africa and beyond. And can anyone doubt that the result of this competition of races will be the 'survival of the fittest'?"

Others, including Herman von Holst (1841-1904), James Schouler (1839-1920), James Ford Rhodes (1848-1927), and their students, began to preach the superiority of the Anglo-Saxon race. Many American historians imitated the old masters, George Bancroft and Francis Parkman, both of whom had been convinced that the march of civilization was best served by Anglo-Saxon Protestants. In the clash between imperialists and anti-imperialists at the close of the nineteenth century, the pro-imperialist school spoke emotionally of the mission of the American "race." (*See Reading No. 28.*)

The American Nordic Movement. By the end of the century, Anglo-Saxonism was supplanted by Nordicism. In 1916, Madison Grant (1865-1937), lawyer and amateur anthropologist, wrote *The Passing of a Great Race,* in which he defended the doctrine of the nobility of the Nordic race. The Nordic race, he said, was physically superior. He praised its fair skin and the Nordic high instep, which, he said, was long esteemed as an indication of the patrician type while the flat foot was often the test of lowly origin. He asserted that Christ was Nordic in physical and moral attributes. He described the splendid conquistadores of the New World as of Nordic stock, but

"their pure stock did not long survive their new surroundings."

Grant warned that race mixture would lead to degeneration. In the long run, he wrote, the result of the mixture of two races would be a race reverting to the most ancient, generalized and lower type. He pointed to the Mexican Melting Pot, "which is now engaged in demonstrating its incapacity for self-government."

According to Grant, Negroes have always demonstrated that they do not possess the potentiality of progress or initiative from within. It has taken us fifty years, he said, to learn that speaking English, wearing good clothes, and going to school or church could not transform a Negro into a white man. The only possible solution for the Negro question, he asserted, was to establish large colonies and place Negroes outside the pale as laborers and not as settlers.

Grant insisted that he was not anti-Semitic, but he declared a distaste for the Polish Jew, whose "dwarf stature, peculiar mentality, and ruthless self-interest" were being engrained on the stock of the nation. He believed that New York was producing many racial hybrids and "ethnic horrors." He warned his countrymen to learn the lessons of biology and keep their race free from inferior blood. While others attacked the cephalic index as useless in determining differences between races, Grant defended it strongly. (*See Reading No. 29.*)

The dean of American racialists was Henry Fairfield Osborn (1857-1935), whose views, similar to those of Grant, were expressed in more scholarly terms and with the aura of scientific respectability. Osborn saw race as playing a far larger part than either language or nationality in moulding the destinies of men. The noble Nordic race, he was certain, was by far the most creative of all races. When the United States entered World War I in 1917, Osborn announced that "as compared with other races, the Anglo-Saxon branch of the Nordic race is again showing itself to be that upon which the nation must depend for leadership, for courage, for loyalty, for unity and harmony of action, for self-sacrifice and devotion to an ideal." The conservation of the Nordic race, that race

"which has given us the spirit of true Americanism," was merely a matter of love of country. There was immense danger, he felt, in the gradual dying-out of great hereditary racial traits in the United States. "It only requires a single dark-eyed ancestor to lend dark hair and eye color to an otherwise pure Nordic strain."

Probably the most zealous apostle of the Nordic myth was Lothrop Stoddard (1883-1950), lawyer and publicist. In a series of popular books, Stoddard viewed with alarm the "denordicization" of the United States. In *Revolt Against Civilization: The Menace of the Under-Man* (1922), he attempted to show how racial impoverishment had destroyed the great societies of the past and how it threatened to destroy the American civilization. (*See Reading No. 30.*) The influx of the "Under-Man," the inferior races, was an unmitigated disaster, a grim peril to civilization. The Under-Man, uncivilizable by nature, had declared war on civilization. Stoddard recommended that, to combat the rebellion of the Under-Man, a war of chaos must be waged by a Neo-Aristocracy against dark racial forces.

In *The Rising Tide of Color Against White World Supremacy* (1920), Stoddard noted happily that Nordics everywhere were strengthened by the consciousness of genetic worth. The United States, he said, originally settled almost exclusively by Nordics, had been harmed by the invasion in the late nineteenth century of a horde of immigrant Alpines and Mediterraneans, not to mention Asiatic elements such as Levantines and Jews, who had crowded out the native Nordic Americans. The result was a mongrelized off-spring, "a walking chaos, so consumed by his jarring heredities that he is quite worthless."

Many lesser publicists espoused the cause of Nordicism in the United States. Hamilton James Eckenrode, a Virginia historian, sought to explain the cause of the Civil War on the basis of racialism. Charles Brigham tried to show the superiority of the white race. Clinton Stoddard Burr's *America's Race Heritage* (The National Historical Society, New York, 1922) and Charles Winthrop Gould's *America: A Family Matter* (New York, 1920) echoed Stoddard's viewpoint.

The Nordic school in general opposed immigration to the United States as unsound on the ground that it degenerated American racial stock and drove down standards of living. Madison Grant defined the theory of the Melting Pot as a fatuous belief in the all-pervading power of democracy to obliterate race characteristics in one generation. He professed himself as greatly shocked by a poster issued during World War I by Howard Chandler Christy depicting a girl of "pure Nordic type" appealing for Liberty Loans and pointing with pride to a list of names, saying "Americans All!: DuBois, Smith, O'Brien, Knutson, Cejko, Haucke, Kowalski, Chriczanevicz." This was too much for Grant. "The one native American," he complained, "is hidden under the sobriquet of Smith, and there is an implied suggestion that the very beautiful lady is a product of this Melting Pot." Similarly, Grant denounced Italian-Americans as inferior. "There is little doubt," he wrote, "that the population of this country would be substantially as large as it is now if no immigrants whatever had come in during the last hundred years, and it is equally certain that the Americans would not have despised manual labor as they do now." He criticized steamship companies for opposing restriction of immigration and transporting live freight to be dumped into the United States.

The Psychologists. Added to the Nordic publicists was a small group of psychologists who attempted to prove that the old native American stock was racially superior to others. William McDougall (1871-1938), an English psychologist and Professor of Psychology at Duke University from 1927-1938, defended the idea of the innate superiority of the Nordic race. Other psychologists agreed, concluding that immigrants from Europe were inferior to native-born Americans, and Negroes inferior to all. Intelligence tests were used to demonstrate the existence of a racial hierarchy based on intelligence, the descending order being Nordic, Alpine, Mediterranean. For example, A. H. Arlett measured the intelligence quotient of various groups and obtained the results shown in Table 6.

Table 6 *Arlett's Measurements of Intelligence Quotient*

Test Group	I.Q.
Americans of high social status: sons of American-born white	125
Americans of semi-professional and business class: sons of American-born white	118
Americans of skilled labor class: sons of American-born white	107
Americans of semi-skilled and unskilled labor class: American-born white	92
Italians	84
Colored	83

The conclusion that a distinct correlation existed between racial origin, socio-economic status, and intelligence was hailed by racialists as corroboration of their views.

The Anti-Nordic School. In the United States, an anti-Nordic school of scholars attacked the Nordicists on the ground that racial characteristics were irrelevant. It sought to demonstrate the falsity of the thesis that the Nordic race alone is capable of creating a high culture. It censured the thesis of pure races. Roland B. Dixon (1875-1934), Harvard University anthropologist, collected thousands of human skulls and concluded that every people showed evidence of racial intermixture. If ethnic mingling could have ruined mankind, he said, it would have done so many years ago. He believed it even possible that a degree of racial mixture stimulated human intelligence and enterprise.

William Zebina Ripley (1867-1941), Harvard University sociologist, utilizing the sciences of physical anthropology and prehistoric archaeology, stated that there was no such thing as an Aryan race. He denounced all attempts to correlate linguistic data with physical characteristics as unscientific. Franz Boas (1858-1942), Columbia University anthropologist, vigorously attacked the ideas that the historical fate of a nation depends upon its racial constitution and that purity of race is the deciding element in the development of a people. "I insist that nobody has ever given satisfactory proofs of any inherent inequality of races." Boas drew the following conclusions,

which, in effect, summarized the sentiments of the anti-Nordic school:

1. The biological homogeneity of any race is a fiction.
2. Every race contains family strains which are biologically distinct.
3. The physical and psychological behavior of the individual depends only in part on his hereditary characteristics.
4. Cultural influences strongly modify hereditary traits.

Some anti-Nordicists turned to ridicule in countering the allegations of Nordic mythology. The anthropologist A. L. Kroeber attributed to "egocentric imagination" the alarm of the racialists that human progress would decay if the Nordic race should lose its fertility. The sociologist Griffith Taylor condemned the concept of Nordic superiority as absurd and unworthy of serious consideration. The historian J. H. Breasted stated plainly that the Aryans were a speech family and not a race. The educator Nicholas Murray Butler denied the existence of pure races and described Europe as a continent of "energetic mongrels." The publicist V. F. Calverton spoke of the appeal to race, blood, and biology as "antiquated and asinine." The newspaperman Waldemar Kaempffert described the Aryans as "as nebulous as Mrs. Harris." The psychologist Otto Klineberg condemned American racialists as unscientific. There were many others who spoke out against racialism. By far the overwhelming majority of American scientists and scholars refused to accept racialist ideology.

— 11 —

THE UNESCO STATEMENTS ON RACE

Background. The United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) was established as a specialized agency of the United Nations on November 4, 1946. Its purpose was to promote collaboration among nations through education, science, and culture in order to further justice, rule of law and human rights, and freedoms without distinctions of race, sex, language, or religion. By its nature, UNESCO from its beginning was concerned with the issue of racialism. The preamble to its constitution declared: "The great and terrible war which has now ended was a war made possible by the denial of the democratic principles of dignity, equality and mutual respect of men, and by the propagation, in their place, through ignorance and prejudice, of the doctrine of the inequality of men and races."

At the sixth session of the United Nations Economic and Social Council, one of the principal organs of the United Nations, a resolution was adopted requesting UNESCO "to consider the desirability of initiating and recommending the general adoption of a program of disseminating scientific facts to remove what is generally known as race prejudice." UNESCO replied by instructing its Director-General "to study and collect scientific materials concerning the question of race; to give wide diffusion to the scientific information collected; to prepare an educational campaign based on this information."

Statement of 1950. The performance of UNESCO on this vital problem was one of the most important contributions in the last century to an understanding of race

and racialism. From December 12 to 14, 1949, a committee of anthropologists, psychologists, and sociologists met in Paris with the task of defining the concept of race and of giving an account in clear and easily understandable terms of our present knowledge regarding the highly controversial problem of racial differences. Scholars of different nationalities represented various disciplines in both the natural and social sciences. The Statement of 1950, published on July 18, 1950, was drafted by Professors Ernest Beaglehole, New Zealand; Juan Comas, Mexico; L. A. Costa Pinto, Brazil; E. Franklin Frazier, United States; Morris Ginsberg, United Kingdom; Claude Levi-Strauss, France; M. F. Ashley Montagu, United States; and Dr. Humayun Kabir, India.

The full text of the Statement of 1950 is reprinted in Part II of this book. (*See Reading No. 31.*) The salient points were:

(1) Scientists agree that mankind is one: that all men belong to the same species, *Homo sapiens*.

(2) From the biological point of view, *Homo sapiens* is made up of a number of populations.

(3) A race, from a biological point of view, may be defined as one of a group of populations constituting the species *Homo sapiens*.

(4) The term "race" designates a group or population characterized by some concentrations, relative as to frequency and distributions, of hereditary particles (genes) or physical characters, which appear, fluctuate, and often disappear in the course of time by reason of geographic and/or cultural isolation.

(5) Many national, religious, geographic, linguistic, or cultural groups have been falsely termed "races."

(6) It would be better to drop the term "race" altogether when speaking of human relations and use the designation *ethnic groups* instead.

(7) Most scientists today agree in classifying the greater divisions of mankind into Mongoloid, Negroid, and Caucasoid divisions.

(8) There is no general agreement on the number of sub-groups.

(9) Intelligence tests do not in themselves enable us to differentiate between innate capacity and environmental influences.

(10) Inherited genetic differences are not a major factor in producing differences between the culture of peoples.

(11) So far as temperament is concerned, there is no definite evidence that there exist inborn differences between human groups.

(12) Personality and character may be considered raceless.

(13) No convincing evidence exists that race-mixture of itself produces biologically bad effects.

(14) The biological fact of race and the myth of race should be distinguished.

(15) The characteristics in which human groups differ from each other are often exaggerated and used to question the validity of equality in the ethical sense.

The statement concluded with the contention that biological studies lend support to the ethic of universal brotherhood. "Man is born with drives toward co-operation."

Criticism of the Declaration of 1950. The Statement of 1950 was well received by the public, but it was criticized by physical anthropologists and geneticists on the basis that most members of the original committee were sociologists. It was charged that this committee, while agreeing to define race biologically, still tended to confuse race as a biological fact with the idea of race as a social phenomenon. The critics refused to acknowledge that there are no mental differences between racial groups. Strong censure was directed at the concluding statement that "man is born with drives toward co-operation."

To meet these objections, UNESCO requested a second set of scientists, consisting this time solely of physical anthropologists and geneticists, to draw up a text "reflecting more accurately the views of scientific circles."

Statement of 1951. Accordingly, UNESCO called on twelve scientists, who met from June 4 to June 8, 1951, at UNESCO House, Paris: R. A. M. Bergman (Royal Tropical Institute, Amsterdam); Gunnar Dahlberg (University of Uppsala); L. C. Dunn (Columbia University); J. B. S. Haldane (University College, London); M. F. Ashley Montagu (Rutgers University); A. E. Mourant (Lister Institute, London); Hans Nachtscheim (Berlin University); Eugène Schreider (L'École des Hautes Études,

Paris); Harry L. Shapiro (American Museum of Natural History); J. C. Trevor (University of Cambridge); H. V. Vallois (Directeur du Musée de l'Homme, Paris); S. Zuckerman (University of Birmingham); and Th. Dobzhansky (Columbia University). Dr. Julian Huxley contributed to the final wording.

The full text of the Statement of 1951 is reprinted in Part II. (*See Reading No. 32.*) In general, the main conclusions of the previous Statement of 1950 were upheld, but omissions were made and some assertions changed. The salient points were:

(1) All men living today belong to a single species, *Homo sapiens,* and are derived from a single stock.

(2) Physical differences between human groups are due to differences in heredity and environment.

(3) It is a serious but common error to use the term race for either national, religious, geographical, linguistic, or cultural groups.

(4) Human races can be classified in different ways by different anthropologists.

(5) Most anthropologists do not include mental characteristics in their classification of human races.

(6) Inherited genetic differences are not a major factor in producing the differences between cultures.

(7) There is no evidence for the existence of so-called pure races. There is no reliable evidence that disadvantageous effects are produced by hybridization of races.

(8) Equality of opportunity and equality of law in no way depend upon the assertion that human beings are in fact equal in endowment.

(9) The following are scientifically established facts:

a. The only effective characteristics for race classification are physical (anatomical and physiological).
b. Groups of mankind do not differ in innate capacity and emotional development.
c. Some biological differences between human beings within one race may be as great, or greater than, the same biological differences between races.
d. Genetic differences are of little significance in determining social and cultural differences.
e. There is no evidence that race mixture produces bad biological results. Social results of race mixture are due to social factors.

Criticism of the Declaration of 1951. The new committee was careful to submit its statement to nearly one hundred anthropologists and geneticists throughout the world. Most replied, either evaluating the declaration as a whole, criticizing it in detail, or submitting a new statement "free of defects." Nearly every sentence was evaluated or criticized. Twenty-three commentators gave "unreserved approval," but the majority, while agreeing with the general tenor, made criticisms of details or expressed strong reservations. Divergent views were presented, at times emotionally, on occasion impatiently, at times even indignantly.

Those who approved the Declaration of 1951 described it as an accurate picture of the present state of the race question. One commentator endorsed it as "an authoritative statement [*which*] will help to eliminate pseudo-scientific race conceptions." It was variously characterized as "timely," "authoritative," "disinterested," and "non-propagandist." The scholars who drew up the report were approved as "men whose names are guarantees of objectivity and scientific integrity."

There was also some strong criticism. It was charged that: (1) The terminology was too technical for the lay public; (2) the statement lacked a good flow of ideas; (3) it was too long; and (4) it was not full enough and left out important aspects of the problem. It was condemned as "loose and ambiguous" (Kenneth Mather); as "partly meaningless and partly negative" (C. D. Darlington); as "not convincing" (Giuseppe Genna); as "smacking of special pleading and lack of logic" (Roger Summers). Carleton S. Coon, University Museum, Philadelphia, stated: "The spirit is fine, it is wholly in keeping with the trends of the times. . . . However, I *do not* approve of slanting scientific data to support a racial theory, since that is just what the Russians are doing, and what Hitler did."

Perhaps the most surprising criticism came from Professor Walter Scheidt, Director, Anthropologisches Institut, University of Hamburg, Germany. A distinguished racial biologist, Scheidt "imagined" that the group of experts would be reluctant to give Germans an opportunity to participate objectively in the discussions. "[*There*

is a] repetition in this statement of *all* the [*National Socialist racialist*] errors in reverse. . . . I can have no part in attempts to solve political manifestoes, as is the practice in Soviet Russia and now at UNESCO as well. . . . Any objections which Germans might raise to the statement . . . would probably be misconstrued as a survival of Nazi ideas."

Significance of the UNESCO Statements. Despite the air of controversy surrounding it, the UNESCO undertaking was a valuable attempt to make available the results of the most recent scientific research on race and racialism. Granted that there were hesitations, contradictions, even bitter recriminations, the studies, nevertheless, gave support for these conclusions:

1. All human groups are mixtures.
2. Pure race is an absurdity.
3. Equality of opportunity and equality in law do not depend on physical, intellectual, and genetic identity.

In these respects the two UNESCO statements opposed the anti-rationalist system of racialism as at odds with the humanist traditions of civilization.

— 12 —

RACIALISM IN THE CONTEMPORARY WORLD

The Continuing Ideology. Racialism was certainly the least fruitful of the efforts to create a social science. Systematic racial thought, with its myths and fallacies, became a dogma of Western pseudo-science. As a complex of attitudes, it was used to justify either nationalism or imperialism, two of the most powerful forces of modern times. It was the product of the anxieties of the age—brought on by rapid political and socio-economic changes.

Racialism has fallen from intellectual respectability, but this does not mean the end of racial thought in the world. The same anxieties which contributed so heavily to the rise of racial myths still exist today. There is this important difference, however: individual expressions of contemporary racialism no longer have the support of science.

Racial Movement in the United States. In the last decade, race relations in the United States have taken the form of the greatest protest movement in American Negro history. The call for equality of political, social, and economic treatment has been strong and persistent. In 1954 the U.S. Supreme Court, in Brown v. Board of Education of Topeka (347 U.S. 483), reversed Plessy v. Ferguson (1896), which had granted "separate but equal" railroad facilities. In the Brown case, which concerned elementary education, the Court held unanimously that segregation in public education was a denial of equal protection of the laws. (*See Reading No. 33.*) The next year the Court directed lower courts to admit Negroes to public schools "with all deliberate speed." The reaction was compliance plus hostility. The Alabama Senate passed a "nullification resolution," and the Virginia legislature declared its right to "interpose its sovereignty" against the Supreme Court decision.

In early 1960, Negro students in Greensboro, North Carolina, organized a formal protest against segregation by taking seats at a lunch counter and declining to leave when they were refused service. In the next two years, the sit-ins increased as "Freedom Riders" sought to force desegregation at lunch counters in many Southern cities. Some communities yielded, others met protest with violence. Negro leaders, notably the Rev. Martin Luther King, sought to arouse the public conscience against racial discrimination.

In late September 1962, at the beginning of the academic year, James H. Meredith, a Negro, sought admittance to the University of Mississippi. Governor Ross Barnett came to the campus and personally took charge as special registrar to deny admittance to Meredith. The

U.S. Department of Justice stepped in to force the Governor to obey the law. The issue had become one of compliance with the Constitution and the courts.

Race in World Politics. The idea of white supremacy was challenged not only in the United States, but throughout the world. In South Africa, Albert John Luthuli, a former Zulu chief who was awarded the 1960 Nobel Peace Prize, attacked *apartheid* as a "museum piece in our time." (*See Reading No. 34.*) The theory was that the white race, long supreme, has been weakened by two great civil wars in this century; it cannot survive another; it must now face the might of races long held in subjugation.

More than the Western white race is involved in this continuing racialism. Typical of racial conflict at another level was the situation in British Guiana, which has been divided by a long-festering racial struggle between 294,000 rural East Indians and 187,000 Negroes who live in the towns. In mid-February 1962, some 10,000 Negroes set fire to Indian-owned shops in Georgetown in a protest against Prime Minister Cheddi Jagan's government and destroyed almost 20% of the city. Jagan blamed the riots on a rightist plot against his Marxist-oriented government, but racial undertones provided the spark for the outbreak.

There are some who view the future with pessimism. With a population explosion in Africa and Asia, with Western colonialism dying, with China pursuing a belligerent policy in its "great leap forward," it may be that the great conflict of the late twentieth century will be dominantly racial. In that case, racialism could well replace nationalism as the most powerful force in the world, "more important than civilization, humanity, decency, kindness, pity; more important than life itself."

Part II

READINGS

— Reading No. 1 —

COMTE DE BUFFON: MAN AS ONE SPECIES*

In his Natural History, *which appeared originally in 1749, George Louis Leclerc, Comte de Buffon (1708-1788) introduced the concept that man is one "species" which has split into numerous varieties. This point of view was taken later by the monogenists, in opposition to the polygenists, who held that differences in races were due only to varying origins.*

Upon the whole, every circumstance concurs in proving, that mankind is not composed of species essentially different from each other; that, on the contrary, there was originally one species, who, after multiplying and spreading over the whole surface of the earth, have undergone various changes by the influence of climate, food, mode of living, epidemic diseases, and the mixture of dissimilar individuals; that, at first, these changes were not so conspicuous, and produced only individual varieties; that these varieties became afterwards specific, because they were rendered more general, more strongly marked, and more permanent by the continual action of the same causes; that they are transmitted from generation to generation, as deformities or diseases pass from parents to children; and that, lastly, as they were originally produced by a train of external and accidental causes, and have only been perpetuated by time and the constant operation of these causes, it is probable that they will gradually disappear, or at least that they will

* George Louis Leclerc, Comte de Buffon, *Histoire naturelle générale et particulière,* trans. by William Smellie (London, 1860), I, 286.

differ from what they are at present, if the causes which produced them should cease, or if their operations should be varied by other circumstances and combinations.

— Reading No. 2 —

JOHANN FRIEDRICH BLUMENBACH: THE FIVE PRINCIPAL VARIETIES OF MANKIND*

In 1775, Johann Friedrich Blumenbach (1752-1840), in his doctoral dissertation in medicine, presented the following scheme of five human races. The number of diagnostic traits for each of the races was much greater than that of any predecessor. Blumenbach's system introduced a richer mass of factual data than that of Linnaeus or Buffon.

. . . After a long and attentive consideration, all mankind, as far as it is at present known to us, seems to me as if it may best, according to natural truth, be divided into the five following varieties; which may be designated by the names *Caucasian, Mongolian, Ethiopian, American,* and *Malay*. I have allotted the first place to the Caucasian, for the reasons given below, which make me esteem it the primeval one. This diverges in both directions into two, most remote and very different from each other; on the one side, namely, into the Ethiopian, and on the other into the Mongolian. The remaining two occupy the intermediate positions between that primeval one and these two extreme varieties; that is, the American

* Johann Friedrich Blumenbach, *De Generis humani varietate nativa* trans. by Thomas Bendysshe (3rd rev. ed., London, 1795), sect. IV, #81, 82.

between the Caucasian and Mongolian; the Malay between the same Caucasian and Ethiopian.

Characters and limits of these varieties. In the following notes and descriptions these five varieties must be generally defined. To this enumeration, however, I must prefix a double warning; first, that on account of the multifarious diversity of the characters, according to their degrees, one or two alone are not sufficient, but we must take several joined together; and then that this union of characters is not so constant but what it is liable to innumerable exceptions in all and singular of these varieties. Still this enumeration is so conceived as to give a sufficiently plain and perspicuous notion of them in general.

Caucasian variety. Colour white, cheeks rosy . . . hair brown or chestnut-colored . . . head subglobular . . . face oval, straight, its parts moderately defined, forehead smooth, nose narrow, slightly hooked, mouth small. . . . The primary teeth placed perpendicularly to each jaw . . . the lips (especially the lower one) moderately open, the chin full and rounded. . . .

Mongolian variety. Colour yellow . . . hair black, stiff, straight and scanty . . . head almost square . . . face broad, at the same time flat and depressed, the parts therefore less distinct, as it were running into one another; glabella flat, very broad; nose small, apish; cheeks usually globular, prominent outwardly; the opening of the eyelids narrow, linear; chin slightly prominent. . . .

Ethiopian variety. Colour black . . . hair black and curly . . . head narrow, compressed at the sides . . . forehead knotty, uneven; malar bones protruding outwards; eyes very prominent; nose thick, mixed up as it were with the wide jaws . . . alveolar edge narrow, elongated in front; the upper primaries obliquely prominent . . . the lips (especially the upper) very puffy; chin retreating. . . .

American variety. Copper-coloured . . . hair black, stiff, straight and scanty . . . forehead short; eyes set very deep; nose somewhat apish, but prominent; the face invariably broad, with cheeks prominent, but not flat or depressed; its parts, if seen in profile, very distinct, and as it were deeply chiselled . . . the shape of the forehead and head in many artificially distorted. . . .

Malay variety. Tawny-coloured . . . hair black, soft, curly, thick and plentiful . . . head moderately narrowed; forehead slightly swelling . . . nose full, rather wide, as it were diffuse, end thick; mouth large . . . upper jaw somewhat prominent with the parts of the face when seen in profile, sufficiently prominent and distinct from each other. . . .

— Reading No. 3 —

WILLIAM ZEBINA RIPLEY: CLASSIFICATION—THE THREE EUROPEAN RACES*

William Zebina Ripley (1867-1941), Professor of Sociology at Harvard University, published his classic The Races of Europe *in 1899. Ripley's classification of three European races (Teutonic, Celtic, Mediterranean), as reproduced in the excerpts below, was accepted for many years as basic throughout the English-speaking world.*

✓ ✓ ✓

The first of our races is perhaps the most characteristic. It is entirely restricted to northwestern Europe, with a centre of dispersion in Scandinavia. Each of the other types extends beyond the confines of the continent, one in Asia, the other into Africa. . . . (Portraits of Norwegian soldiers) show certain of the physical peculiarities, especially the great length of the head, the long oval face, and the straight aquiline nose. The face is rather smooth in outline, the cheek bones not being prominent. The narrow nose seems to be a very constant trait, as much so as

* William Zebina Ripley, *The Races of Europe* (New York, 1899), extracted from chap. 6.

the tendency to tall stature. This race is strongly inclined to blondness. The eyes are blue or light grey, and the hair flaxen, tawny, reddish or sandy. The whole combination accords exactly with the descriptions handed down to us by the ancients. Such were the Goths, Danes, Norsemen, Saxons, and their fellows of another place and time. History is thus strictly corroborated by natural science.

A distinctive feature of the Teutonic race, which we have not yet mentioned, is its prominent and narrow nose. This is notable, in general, as a fact of common observation, but it is very difficult of anthropometric proof. The range of individual variation in the fleshy parts seems to be very great, even in the same race. There is some indication, moreover, that the nasal bones are influenced by the structure of the face. The lack of any international agreement as to the system of measurement renders statistical comparisons doubly difficult. Nevertheless, enough has been done to show that from the north of Europe, as we go south, the nose betrays a tendency to become flatter and more open at the wings. Especially where the Alpine and Teutonic types are in contact do we find the flatter nose of the broad-headed race noticeable. Arbo has observed it in the southwestern corner of Norway. Houze proves it for Belgium in comparison of Flemings and Walloons; it is certainly true in France that the Teutonic elements are more leptorhin (narrow-nosed) than the Alpine. The association of a tall stature with a narrow nose is so close as to point to a law. Italy shows a regular increase in frequency of the broad and flat nose from north to south; and Collignon's law of the association of the form of nose to stature seems again to be confirmed. From this point south, even from the Mediterranean coast in Tunis toward the interior, the broad and open form of nose, extremely developed in the negro race, becomes more common. . . .

Our second racial type is most persistently characterized by the shape of the head. This is short and at the same time broad. The roundness is accompanied by a broad face, the chin full and the nose rather heavy. These traits are all shown more or less clearly in our portraits of the Austrian German, and of the two Bavarian peasants. The side views in the latter cases show the shortness of the head as contrasted with the Teutonic type above described. At the same time the cranium is high, the forehead straight, sometimes almost overhanging. It seems as if pressure had been applied front and back, the skull having yielded in an upward direction. This type is of medium height, decidedly inclined toward stockiness in build. Its whole aspect is rather of solidity than of agility. The colour of the hair and eyes is rather neutral, at all events intermediate between the Teutonic and Mediterranean races. There is a tendency toward greyish eyes, while the hair is more often brown. In these respects, however, there is great variability, and the transition to the north and south is very gradual. Climate or other environmental influence has in these traits eliminated all sharp division lines. These peculiarities appear only when the [*Celtic*] type is found in extreme isolation and purity. . . .

We now come to the last of our three races, which is generally known as the Mediterranean or Iberian type. It prevails everywhere south of the Pyrenees, along the southern coast of France and in southern Italy, including Sicily and Sardinia. Once more we return to a type of head form almost identical with the Teutonic, in the oval face and the prominent occiput of this third type. The cephalic index drops from 87 and above in the Alps to about 75 all along the line. This is the primary fact to be noted. Coincidently, the colour of the hair and eyes becomes very dark, almost black. The figure is less amply proportioned; the people become light, slender, and rather agile. As to the bodily height of this third race two varieties are to-day recognised: the group north of the Mediterranean is exceedingly short, while the African Berbers are of goodly size. Authorities are, however, divided as to the significance of this. It has been shown that while the average height of the Sardinians, for example, is low, a considerable number, and those of the purest type in other respects, are of a goodly stature . . . Lapouge . . . especially, discovers a marked tendency in southern France away from this excessive shortness. It may indeed be that, as we have already suggested, too protracted civilization is responsible for this diminutiveness on the northern shore of the Mediterranean. At all events, despite this subdivision, the substantial unity of the southern dolichocephalic group is recognised by all authorities.

— Reading No. 4 —

JOSEPH DENIKER: CLASSIFICATION OF RACES*

Joseph Deniker (1852-1918), born in Astrakhan, Russia, eventually came to Paris, where he became a librarian and a noted anthropologist. In 1900 he published his Les races et les peuples de la terre, *which added three more races to Ripley's three principal races. Before Darwin, it was believed that language held the key to racial origins. Later, the cephalic index was considered to be vital in the identification of races. Deniker at the turn of the century insisted that racial differences were physical only. Yet, the classification he made, as reprinted below, was strongly tied up with geographical divisions.*

✓ ✓ ✓

Some years ago I proposed a classification of the human races, based solely on physical characters. . . . A mass of new material, and my own researches, have compelled me since then to modify this classification. This is how it may be summarised in the form of a table, giving to my former "types" the title of races or sub-races, and grouping them under six heads—

A. WOOLLY HAIR, BROAD NOSE		RACES AND SUB-RACES	
	Yellow skin, steatopygous, short stature, dolichocephalic	*Bushmen* (s.r. Hottentots and Bushmen)	1
Dark skin	Reddish-brown, very short stature, sub-brachycephalic or sub-dolichocephalic	*Negrito* (s.r. Negrillo and Negrito)	2
	Black, stature tall, dolichocephalic	*Negro* (s.r. Nigritian and Bantu	3
	Brownish-black, medium stature, dolichocephalic	*Melanesian* (s.r. Papuan and Melanesian	4

*Joseph Deniker, *The Races of Man* (London, 1900), section titled "Classification of Races and Peoples." Original edition, *Les races et les peuples de la terre* (Paris, 1900).

B. CURLY OR WAVY HAIR			
Dark skin	Reddish-brown, narrow nose, tall stature, dolichocephalic	*Ethiopian*	5
	Chocolate-brown, broad nose, medium stature, dolichocephalic	*Australian*	6
	Brownish-black, broad or narrow nose, short stature, dolichocephalic	*Dravidian* (s.r. Platyrhine and Leptorhine)	7
	Skin of a tawny white, nose narrow hooked, with thick top, brachycephalic	*Assyroid*	8

C. WAVY BROWN OR BLACK HAIR, DARK EYES				
		Clear brown skin, black hair, narrow, straight or convex nose, tall stature, dolichocephalic	*Indo-Afghan*	9
Tawny white skin, black hair	Tall stature, elongated face	Aquiline nose, promminent occiput, dolichocephalic, elliptical form of face	*Arab or Semite*	10
		Straight coarse nose, dolichocephalic, square face	*Berber* (4 sub-races)	11
		Straight fine nose, mesocephalic, oval face	*Littoral-European*	12
	Short stature, dolichocephalic		*Ibero-insular*	13
Dull white skin, brown hair		Short stature, strongly brachycephalic, round face	*Western European*	14
		Tall stature, brachycephalic elongated face	*Adriatic*	15

D. FAIR, WAVY OR STRAIGHT HAIR, LIGHT EYES			
Reddish white skin, hair	Somewhat wavy, reddish; tall stature, dolichocephalic	*Northern European*	16
	Somewhat straight, flaxen-haired, short stature, subbrachycephalic	*Eastern European*	17

E. STRAIGHT OR WAVY HAIR, DARK, BLACK EYES

	Light brown skin, very hairy body, broad and concave nose, dolichocephalic	*Ainu*	18
Yellow skin, smooth body	Prominent nose, sometimes convex, tall stature, elliptical form of face, brachy- or meso-cephalic	*Polynesian*	19
	Short stature, flattened, sometimes concave nose, projecting cheek-bones, lozenge-shaped face, dolichocephalic	*Indonesian*	20
	Short stature, prominent straight or concave nose, meso- or dolicho-cephalic	*South American* (s.r. Palaeo-Am. & S. Amer.)	21

F. STRAIGHT HAIR

Warm yellow skin	Straight or aquiline nose	Tall stature, mesocephalic	*North American* (s.r. Atlantic and Pacific)	22
		Short stature, brachycephalic	*Central American*	23
	Straight nose, tall stature, brachycephalic, square face		*Patagonian*	24
Brownish-yellow skin, short stature, round flattened face, dolichocephalic			*Eskimo*	25
Yellowish white skin	Turned-up nose, short stature, brachycephalic		*Lapp*	26
	Straight or concave nose, short stature, meso- or dolicho-cephalic, projecting cheek-bones		*Ugrian* (s.r. Ugrian and Yeniseian)	27
	Straight nose, medium stature, strongly brachycephalic		*Turkish* or *Turco-Tartar*	28
Pale yellow skin, projecting cheek-bones, Mongoloid eye, slightly brachycephalic			*Mongol* (s.r. Northern and Southern)	29

My table contains the enumeration of the principal somatic characters for each race. Arranged dichotomically for convenience of research, it does not represent the exact grouping of the races according to their true affinities. It would be vain to attempt to exhibit these affinities in the lineal arrangement of a table; each race, in fact, manifests some points of resemblance, not only with its neighbors in the upper or lower part of the table, but also with others which are remote from it, in view of the technical necessities of construction of such a table. In order to exhibit the affinities in question, it would be necessary to arrange the groups according to the three dimensions of space, or at least on a surface where we can avail ourselves of two dimensions. . . .

— Reading No. 5 —

ANDERS ADOLF RETZIUS: THE CEPHALIC INDEX AND THE IDENTIFICATION OF RACES*

The application of quantitative methods to biology was initiated by Lambert Adolphe Jacques Quételet (1796-1874), a Belgian statistician, in his principal work published in 1835, Sur l'homme et le développement de ses facultés, ou essai de physique social. *In this study Quételet presented a résumé of his statistical researches on the physical and intellectual qualities of the "average man."*

In 1860, Anders Adolf Retzius (1796-1860), a Swedish physician and comparative anatomist, began to apply the use of arithmetical methods to the study of ethnology. A

* Anders Adolf Retzius, "A Glance at the Present State of Ethnology with Reference to the Form of the Skull," trans. from the Swedish, in the *British and Foreign Medico-Chirurgical Review* (25), 1860, pp. 366 ff.

pioneer in holding the belief that head shape, as defined in the ratio of cranial breadth to length, would identify the various races in exact measurements, Retzius was responsible for turning the study of race from concern with skin color to examination of the cephalic index. In the following opening section of one of his major papers, Retzius attempted to correlate head shapes with sociolinguistic units. From this point on, racialists used the cephalic index in efforts to prove the superiority of the dolichocephalic head form.

✓ ✓ ✓

When, twelve years ago, a paper was read before this distinguished Association, "On the Form of the Skull in Different Nations," based upon the principles I had put forward two years previously at the meeting of the Scandinavian Association of Naturalists at Stockholm, the science was entirely new and untried, with a still uncertain future and with great voids to fill. Since that time, the classification of forms then assumed has gained both in stability and extent, and it is to give a brief report of this progress that I have ventured to claim for an hour the attention of this distinguished meeting.

A. *European Forms of the Skull*

On the occasion already alluded to, I showed that the majority of the people of Western Europe were dolichocephalic, while the brachycephalic was the prevalent form of the skull throughout the great extent of Eastern Europe. I have since from many quarters received confirmation of this opinion.

EUROPEAN DOLICHOCEPHALI

Germans	Norwegians and Normans in France and England Swedes Danes Dutchmen Flemings Burgundians Germans of the Germanic Stock Franks Anglo-Saxons Goths in Italy and Spain	Orthognathic

Celts	Celtic Scotch " Irish " English Welsh Gauls in France, Switzerland, Germany, etc. The Proper Romans Ancient Greeks and their Descendants	Orthognathic

Since I communicated the arrangement which will be found in the Transactions of the former meeting at Christiania, I have examined a considerable number of individuals sprung from Norman families in France and England. Without exception, these individuals had preserved the same oval form of the skull which belongs to the true Normans in Norway.

I have also examined Swedish skulls in hundreds of instances, both from old graves and churchyards and in the dissecting-room, and have likewise found the form already described predominant.

* * *

Since the time already mentioned I have visited Copenhagen, have seen a number of skulls in the museums there, and have also had the opportunity of observing the form of the skulls of a great many Danes, and found that they had perfectly preserved their Germanic dolichocephalic form. The same I found to be the case in Holland and in Belgium and French Flanders; I had previously received from Professor Vrolik, in Amsterdam, several Dutch skulls of the same form, from old graves.

* * *

Through the kindness of the distinguished and zealous archaeologist, Frederick Troyon, I have obtained for the museum in Stockholm several skulls of Burgundians, taken up by Mr. Troyon from old Burgundian burying-places in the canton of Vaud. They all present the Germanic form.

The first Roman skull I had the opportunity of seeing was sent to me by the late Dr. Prichard. This skull was taken on a field of battle (the camp of the Emperor Severus) near York, with another skull of different shape. Dr. Prichard requested my opinion as to the nationality of these two skulls, without giving the slightest hint for my guidance in the matter. I found that the first-men-

tioned skull possessed a quite peculiar dolichocephalic shape, not previously represented among the European skulls in the collection of the Carolinean Institution. . . .

* * *

I have also placed the Greeks upon the list of European dolichocephali; the reason for this I explained in the year 1847, in another place. According to all that I could learn, the dolichocephalic form has never among the Greeks belonged to the majority of the nation, which bears the brachycephalic type. This latter belongs as well to the Greek Slavonians as to the majority of the Levantines and Pelasgi, the Albanians of the present day. In my essay already quoted, I have directed attention to the fact that among ancient statues, Apollo, Venus, and many of the noblest characters, have the dolichocephalic form; while on the contrary, others, as Jupiter and Hercules, have the brachycephalic, probably on account of difference of race in the individuals taken as models by the artist.

To the brachycephali of Europe belong:

Ugrians, (Muller, Latham)	The Samoëids		Orthognathic
	" Laplanders		
	" Voguls		
	" Ostiaks		
	" Permians		
	" Votiaks		
	" Tcheremiss		
	" Morduins		
	" Tchuvatch		
	" Magyars		
	" Finlanders	Finlanders Esthonians Livonians	
Turks			
Slavonians	Bohemians (Tsheks)		Orthognathic
	Wends		
	Slovacks		
	Morlacks		
	Croats		
	Servians		
	Poles		
	Russians		
	Modern Greeks		

Lettish or Lithuanians

Albanians	Orthognathic
Etruscans	
Tuscans	
Rhetians	
Tyrolese	
Basques	

— Reading No. 6 —

FRANZ BOAS: CHANGES IN BODILY FORM OF DESCENDANTS OF IMMIGRANTS*

In 1910, on behalf of the U.S. Immigration Commission, Franz Boas (1858-1942) undertook a study of changes in bodily form of descendants of immigrants. He found that children born only a few years after their elders had come to the United States developed significant bodily differences from those of their foreign-born parents. The process appeared to begin in early childhood and continued through life. Even the form of the head as measured by the cephalic index underwent striking changes. Apparently, environmental factors were of some importance in changing physical characteristics that should have remained stable. Boas's conclusions stirred

* Franz Boas, *Race, Language, and Culture* (New York, 1940), pp. 60 ff. The original report was written for the U.S. Government in 1911. The excerpts reproduced here are from Boas's compendium of his original views in the field of anthropology. Reprinted with the permission of The Macmillan Company.

much international discussion. Here is his own brief summary of his anthropometric study.

✓ ✓ ✓

The following is a brief summary of the principal results of a study of the anthropometric characteristics of immigrants and their descendants.

1. American-born descendants of immigrants differ in type from their foreign-born parents. The changes which occur among various European types are not all in the same direction. They develop in early childhood and persist throughout life.

2. The influence of American environment makes itself felt with increasing intensity, according to the time elapsed between the arrival of the mother and the birth of the child.

* * *

The differences in cephalic index between parents and their own American-born children, born less than ten years after arrival of the mother, and of those born more than ten years after the arrival of the mother, are, −0.83 and −0.92 respectively. Their difference is, therefore, 1.09 with an error of about ±0.22, so that the significance of this difference is also quite probable.

3. The observations on intraracial heredity show an increased variability of children of dissimilar parents, which proves a regression of the children to either parental type, not a regression to the mid-parental type.

4. The head measurements show the same acceleration of growth during the prepubertal period as has long been known for measurements of the bulk of the body, i.e., stature and weight.

5. The average stature of children decreases with the size of the family.

Incidentally, a number of problems were touched upon which are, however, of secondary importance in relation to the whole problem, and the investigation of which was necessary for the correct interpretation of the observations referred to before.

6. The comparison of immigrants and their descendants necessarily refers to groups which immigrated at different periods. For instance, 15-year-old American-born boys are children of parents who immigrated more than 15 years ago; while 15-year-old foreign-born boys are children of parents who immigrated less than 15 years ago. If, therefore, the constitution of the immigration representing a certain people changed, there would be an apparent change of type, which in reality would reflect only the differences in type of the immigrants of various periods. A comparison of individuals born in Europe in a certain year with American-born descendants of mothers who immigrated in the corresponding year showed that for each year the differences observed in the total series persist.

7. The differences between immigrants and their own European-born children are always less than those between them and their own American-born children and the differences agree in direction and value with those obtained from the general population. . . .

8. The width of face of American-born children of immigrants is decidedly narrower than that of the foreign-born. Furthermore there is a decided decline of those born a considerable length of time after the immigration of the mother, so that we get the effect of a cumulative effect of American city environment. The phenomenon is complicated by the fact that the width of face of the immigrants themselves has been declining, in so far as those born in early years, beginning with 1880, show a wider face than later immigrants.

9. When the Hebrew boys are classified according to their pubescence in groups of about equal physiological development, as I, II, III (prepubescent, beginning pubescence, completed pubescence), the same differences persist. This observation is important because it shows that the differences are not due to a retardation of development, for no appreciable differences have been found in the tempo of development of the two groups.

10. Basing my inquiry on the assumption that the variations of hair color in any particular people follow the exponential law, I have shown that numerical values for pigmentation can be obtained. I have divided the whole series of pigmentation from black to ash-blond in 20 equidistant steps, excluding reds, 0 being black, 20 ash-

blond, but not without pigment like the hair of albinos. In this manner the results . . . showing the degree of darkening with increasing age were obtained. . . .

— Reading No. 7 —

KARL PEARSON THE PROBLEM OF PURE RACES*

Karl Pearson (1857-1936), British biometrician and eugenist, expressed his skepticism about the "purity of race" in the following selection from one of his articles.

Some biologists apparently believe they can isolate a pure race, but in the case of man, I feel sure that purity of race is merely a relative term. For a given character one race is purer than a second, if the scientific variation of that character is less than it is in the second. In loose wording, for we cannot express ourselves accurately without mathematical symbols, that race is purer for which on the average the individuals are closer to type for the bulk of ascertainable characters than are the characters in a second race. But an absolutely pure race in man defies definition. The more isolated a group of men has remained, the longer it has lived under the same environment, and the more limited its habitat, the less variation from type it will exhibit, and we can legitimately speak of it as possessing greater purity. We, most of all, probably believe in a single origin of man. But as anthropologists we are inclined to speak as if at the dawn of history there were a number of pure races, each with definite

* Karl Pearson, "The Problems of Anthropology," *Scientific Monthly* (II), 1920, pp. 455-457.

physical and mental characteristics; if this were true, which I do not believe, it could only mean that up to that period there had been extreme isolation, extremely differentiated environment, and so marked differences in the direction and rate of mental and physical evolution. But what we know historically of folk-wanderings, folk-mixings, and folk-absorptions have undoubtedly been going on for hundred of thousands of years, of which we know only a small historic fragment. Have we any real reason for supposing that "purity of race" existed up to the beginning of history, and that we have all got badly mixed up since?

Let us, however, grant that there were purer races at the beginning of history than we find to-day. Let us suppose a Nordic race with a certain stature, a given pigmentation, a given shape of head and a given mentality. And again, we will suppose an Alpine race, differing markedly in type from the Nordic race. What happens if we cross members of the two races and proceed to a race of hybrids? A Mendelian would tell us that these characters are sorted out like cards from a pack in all sorts of novel combinations. A Nordic mentality will be found with short stature and dark eyes. A tall brachycephalic individual will combine Alpine mentality with blue eyes. Without accepting fully the Mendelian theory we can at least accept the result of mass observations, which show that the association between superficial physical measurements and mentality is of the slenderest kind. If you keep within one class, my own measurements show me that there is only the slightest relation between intelligence and size and shape of the head. Pigmentation in this country seems to have little relation to the incidence of disease. . . .

. . . In the highly and recently hybridized nations of Europe there are really but few fragments of "pure races" left, and it is hopeless to believe that anthropometric measurements of the body or records of pigmentation are going to help us to a science of the psycho-physical characters of man which will be useful to the state.

— Reading No. 8 —

HARRY L. SHAPIRO: THE PITCAIRN ISLANDERS AS AN EXAMPLE OF RACE MIXTURE*

One of the basic contentions of racialists is that race mixture invariably leads to degeneration or tends to produce a breed inferior to the parental race. Harry L. Shapiro, Chairman, Department of Anthropology, American Museum of Natural History, New York, presented the case history of Pitcairn Islanders as a means of clarifying some of the issues surrounding the subject of race mixture. He concluded that, far from degenerating, the colony at Pitcairn Island provided some support for the view that the mingling of two diverse strains results in heightened vigor.

✓ ✓ ✓

Perhaps the best known [*example of race mixture*] is the small group of Polynesian-English mixed bloods that live on Pitcairn Island in the South Pacific. Here, on a tiny volcanic island only about two miles long and about half as wide, were resolved the train of events that the famous mutiny of the *Bounty* set in action. This episode, famous in British naval annals, occurred in the year 1789 shortly after H.M.S. *Bounty* had departed from Tahiti where she had been dispatched under the command of Lieutenant William Bligh to collect breadfruit plants. Reports brought back to Europe by Cook and Bougainville described the breadfruit as a remarkable tree capable of supplying a staple article of food with a minimum of effort. British planters in the West Indies, eager to obtain

* Harry L. Shapiro, "Race Mixture," in *The Race Question in Modern Science* (New York, 1956), pp. 354-357, 360-361. Courtesy of United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, Paris.

so easy a source of foodstuff for their slaves, had petitioned for the expedition with which Bligh had been entrusted. Now after six successful months in Tahiti, with the ship's hold full of potted trees, the return trip was interrupted by the mutiny of 25 of the men out of the crew of 44. The mutineers were led by Fletcher Christian, one of Bligh's officers, and a native of the Isle of Man where his family had long been prominent.

The mutineers, seizing the ship, put Bligh and those faithful to him adrift in a small open boat and reset the *Bounty*'s course for Tubuai, an island 300 miles south of Tahiti. Here, an abortive attempt was made to establish a settlement, which failed because of the hostility aroused in the natives by the behaviour of the mutineers. Returning after this to Tahiti, the mutineers split into two groups: one, consisting of 16 men, preferred to remain in Tahiti, where a number of them had already established liaisons with native women and had been welcomed into the island homes; the other contained nine men headed by Christian. These men, apparently anticipating a possible punitive expedition once the news of the mutiny reached England, were eager to leave Tahiti, where they could not hope to escape capture, and to find a more remote and perhaps inaccessible island where they might remain undetected. Accordingly they, together with 12 Tahitian women and six Tahitian men, set sail from Tahiti in September 1789, and until 1808 were virtually lost to the world. In the latter year their retreat on Pitcairn, some 2,500 miles south-east of Tahiti, was discovered by Captain Mayhew Folger. During this interval much had happened on the island. All the Tahitian men and all but one of the Englishmen had died—most of them violently, and after only a short sojourn in their new home. In addition, Folger found eight or nine surviving Tahitian women and 25 children, offspring of six of the Englishmen and their native wives. None of the Tahitian men had left issue, perhaps because they were murdered too soon after the settlement on the island.

From this handful of children—half Polynesian, half-English—the little colony increased by leaps and bounds, until 50 years later there were almost 200 inhabitants on the island. By this time, fear of overpopulation and the recurrence of water shortages induced them to request of the British Government the use of Norfolk Island, some

4,000 miles to the west, as a new home. This considerably larger island had recently been abandoned as a penal colony and was temporarily unoccupied. In 1856 the entire colony moved there and set up a new establishment, but subsequently several families returned to their beloved Pitcairn. In 1864 there were 45 descendants of the mutineers living on Pitcairn, the remainder having gone on to Norfolk. At present there are on both islands about 1,000 descendants of the original colony, not counting those who have married out of the community or settled in New Zealand, Australia and elsewhere.

As an example of race mixture the Pitcairn Islanders are far from typical. But it is the very singularity of the colony that is full of meaning in interpreting race mixture as we commonly see it. Simply as a cross between Polynesians and English they can be matched in many parts of Polynesia where the same kind of mingling has occurred, often with notable results, as in New Zealand. But unlike all other mixtures of this kind in Oceania, and indeed unlike virtually all race mixture wherever it occurs,* the Pitcairn Islanders have lived and developed their common life completely separated from the societies from which they were originally derived. . . .

It is because of all this that the Pitcairn Islanders' complete separation from and independence of all other societies assume added importance, for here the entire community was of the same mixed origin, was free from any social structuring imposed upon it by a larger society and escaped the influences that prejudice subtly works upon its object. This, then, is a community where social prejudice, at least, is not a factor to be considered and where we can study the consequences of race mixture divorced from the concomitant effects that being a part of a larger group might impose. . . .

As far as the Pitcairn Islanders are concerned, I can offer no objective data on their psychological or moral qualities. None, to my knowledge, is available. Certainly there have been many published impressions of these traits of the islanders and most of them are enthusiastic. How far the romantic aura that surrounds these people

* The only parallel to Pitcairn known to me is Tristan da Cunha where a communtiy of mixed Negro-Europeans have lived in isolation for well over 100 years.

has seduced their visitors is beyond calculation. In the mid-nineteenth century the typical reaction was delight in finding so moral, upright and virtuous a colony sprung from mutineers, from violence and from murder. Nowadays, being less concerned with religious matters and having on the whole rather different values, the visitor is less impressed by these qualities and is likely to prize other aspects of their character. For my part, I can only report that, allowing for their isolation and for a consequent lack of sophistication, I found the Pitcairn Islanders an intelligent and attractive people. And I was struck by the number of men and women of impressive character possessed of the qualities that make for leadership. . . .

As far as the evidence goes, then, the Pitcairn experiment lends no support for the thesis that race mixture merely leads to degeneration or at best produces a breed inferior to the superior parental race. In fact, we see in this colony some support for heightened vigour, for an extended variation and for a successful issue of the mingling of two diverse strains.

— Reading No. 9 —

MORITZ JULIUS BONN: RACE AND IMPERIALISM*

How the idea of racialism, the philosophy assuming the existence of largely unchangeable racial characteristics, was applied to the new imperialism, was pointed out in the following passage by Moritz Julius Bonn.

✓ ✓ ✓

For the security of capital, which was emigrating in ever increasing amounts to backward countries, open or disguised political control was essential. Moreover a nation

* Moritz Julius Bonn, "Imperialism," in *Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences,* (New York, 1937), IV, 610. By permission of The Macmillan Company.

without a colonial empire was considered second-rate. The control of dependencies to which emigration could be directed might enable a Germany or an Italy to repeat the great feats of the Anglo-Saxons in America and Australia. This romantic idea disappeared rather quickly, for the lands acquired by new colonial powers were inhabited by native races whose collaboration was essential to success. Modern imperialism became more and more a policy of control of native races by conquest and administration (political colonization) and by financial reorganization and capitalistic development (capitalistic colonization). Both forms of control relied on the superior strength or wisdom—if technical skill can be called wisdom—of the ruling race. The stronger dominated, ruled and exploited the weaker in open contradiction to the principles of Christianity and democracy expounded at home. The required philosophical justification of the new order of things was found in theories of biological evolution. The notion became popular that as superiority enabled a race to survive, survival was a God given proof of superiority; ruling nations were superior nations with a right to rule and exploit and to raise the standards of the whole human family. Lust for power and greed for wealth were not absent in this appeal to a natural law, which had changed its meaning somewhat since the day when settlers naïvely assumed that backward people must die out when brought into contact with superior races. Provided they were willing and capable workers they were now made to breed as fast as they could for the benefit of their masters. Imperialism thus justified biologically and morally was not only a policy and a creed; rulership and exploitation became moral obligations. Kipling spoke of "the white man's burden," United States Senator Albert Beveridge proclaimed that "God has made us adept in government that we may administer government among savage and servile people."

The growth of this biological nationalism meant that imperialism was no longer based on a philosophy of uniting in a common bond of imperial statehood diverse races with equal rights, but rather on a philosophy of tribal supremacy which assumed the existence of racial characteristics largely unchangeable unless through miscegenation.

The ruling race might spread the outer techniques of its life; the ruled race was unfit to understand its inner quality. Missionary activity, long an integral part of imperialism, lost its soul.

— Reading No. 10 —

FRIEDRICH MAX MÜLLER: THE HOME OF THE ARYAS*

Friedrich Max Müller (1823-1900), Anglo-German Orientalist and comparative philologist, was one of the first to use the term "Aryan race" (1861). He wrote about "an irresistible stream of mighty waves rolling forth from the Aryan centre and gradually overflowing the valleys of Asia and Europe." However, as an intellectually honest scholar, he later became convinced that there was a widespread and false identification of race with language. The following selection from his book on the origins of the Aryans (1888) includes the famous passage in which he repudiated his own earlier theories. Still searching for the home of the Aryans, he at the same time warned his fellow scientists about a fundamental error in the use of the term "race."

❦ ❦ ❦

It is difficult to stop a ball after it has once been set rolling, and therefore we cannot be too cautious in starting a ball. The question as to the original home of those who spoke in Aryan language, before the Aryas separated, was a very natural question, and among scholars who

* Friedrich Max Müller, *Biographies of Words and the Home of the Aryas* (London and New York, 1888), pp. 116-121.

bear in mind the natural limitations under which such questions can be answered, I do not say that to place that home provisionally somewhere in Asia was likely to lead to grave misunderstandings. The *prima facie* evidence points certainly to the East, and more than that no one, cognisant of these matters, would expect. We have two streams of language, one tending South-East to India, the other North-West to Europe. The point where these two streams naturally intersect, points to Asia.

Secondly, the earliest centres of civilised life were in Asia. We have evidence of oral literature in India, when there is as yet no trace of it among any of the nations of Europe, least of all in Scandinavia. It was natural therefore, though I say no more, to look to the East as the home of the Aryas.

Thirdly, we see in later times large ethnic waves rising from Central Asia and overwhelming Europe, such as the Huns in the fourth, and the Mongols in the thirteenth century.

Fourthly, if the migration had taken place from Europe to Asia, particularly from Scandinavia, we should naturally look in the common Aryan language for a number of words connected with maritime life. There is, however, no name for the sea shared by the North-Western and South-Eastern branches; while the principal members of the North-Western branch share in common, as we should expect, a name for sea; Lat. m a r e, Old Gaulish m o r e, Old Slav. m o r j e, Goth. m a r e i, and m a r i-s a i v, *λίμνη*.

We know that the people in the North of Europe, and particularly in Scandinavia, depended from the earliest times on fish for their food. The Kjökken-moeddings are there to prove it. But while we find common Aryan names, not only for special domestic animals and birds, but also for animals (p a *s* u) and birds (v i) in general, we look in vain in the ancient Aryan Dictionary, not only for names for any special fishes, but even for a general word for fish. In the Vedic hymns there is no mention of fishes being eaten, nor, as yet, in the Homeric poems. . . .

I have declared again and again that if I say Aryas, I mean neither blood nor bones, nor hair nor skull; I mean simply those who speak an Aryan language. The same applies to Hindus, Greeks, Romans, Germans,

Celts, and Slavs. When I speak of them I commit myself to no anatomical characteristics. The blue-eyed and fair-haired Scandinavians may have been conquerors or conquered, they may have adopted the language of their darker lords or their subjects, or *vice versa.* I assert nothing beyond their language when I call them Hindus, Greeks, Romans, Germans, Celts and Slavs; and in that sense, and in that sense only, do I say that even the blackest Hindus represent an earlier stage of Aryan speech and thought than the fairest Scandinavians. This may seem strong language, but in matters of such importance we cannot be too decided in our language. To me an ethnologist who speaks of Aryan race, Aryan blood, Aryan eyes and hair, is as great a sinner as a linguist who speaks of a dolichocephalic dictionary or a brachycephalic grammar. It is worse than a Babylonian confusion of tongues—it is downright theft. We have made our own terminology for the classification of languages; let ethnologists make their own for the classification of skulls, and hair, and blood.

— Reading No. 11 —

COMTE ARTHUR DE GOBINEAU: "THE INEQUALITY OF HUMAN RACES"*

In 1853-1855 Joseph Arthur, Comte de Gobineau (1816-1882), published his Essai sur l'inégalité des races humaines, *in which he projected the doctrine that the various races of mankind are innately unequal in talent and ability to create culture. Only the white race, he said,*

* Arthur de Gobineau, *The Inequality of Human Races,* trans. by Adrian Collins (New York, 1915), pp. 205-210. By permission of G. P. Putnam's Sons.

is culturally creative, and the "Aryan" was superior to all other races. Gobineau's racialism was not a nationalist but a class concept; he believed in the superiority of the Aryan aristocracy in any country. The first part of the Essai *was translated into English in 1915 by Adrian Collins. The following recapitulation of the characteristics of the three great races is taken from the concluding chapter.*

✓ ✓ ✓

I have shown the unique place in the organic world occupied by the human species, the profound physical, as well as moral, differences separating it from all other kinds of living creatures. Considering it by itself, I have been able to distinguish on physiological grounds alone, three great and clearly marked types, the black, the yellow, and the white. However uncertain the aims of physiology may be, however meagre its resources, however defective its methods, it can proceed thus far with absolute certainty.

The negroid variety is the lowest, and stands at the foot of the ladder. The animal character, that appears in the shape of the pelvis, is stamped on the negro from birth, and foreshadows his destiny. His intellect will always move within a very narrow circle. He is not however a mere brute, for behind his low receding brow, in the middle of his skull, we can see signs of a powerful energy, however crude its objects. If his mental faculties are dull or even non-existent, he often has an intensity of desire, and so of will, which may be called terrible. Many of his senses, especially taste and smell, are developed to an extent unknown to the other two races.

The very strength of his sensations is the most striking proof of his inferiority. All food is good in his eyes, nothing disguists or repels him. What he desires is to eat, to eat furiously, and to excess; no carrion is too revolting to be swallowed by him. It is the same with odours; his inordinate desires are satisfied with all, however coarse or even horrible. To these qualities may be added an instability and capriciousness of feeling, that cannot be tied down to any single object, and which, so far as he is concerned, do away with all distinctions of good and evil.

We might even say that the violence with which he pursues the object that has aroused his senses and inflamed his desires is a guarantee of the desires being soon satisfied and the object forgotten. Finally, he is equally careless of his own life and that of others; he kills willingly, for the sake of killing; and this human machine, in whom it is so easy to arouse emotion, shows, in face of suffering, either a monstrous indifference or a cowardice that seeks a voluntary refuge in death.

The yellow race is the exact opposite of this type. The skull points forward, not backward. The forehead is wide and bony, often high and projecting. The shape of the face is triangular, the nose and chin showing none of the coarse protuberances that mark the negro. There is further a general proneness to obesity, which, though not confined to the yellow type, is found there more frequently than in the others. The yellow man has little physical energy, and is inclined to apathy; he commits none of the strange excesses so common among negroes. His desires are feeble, his will-power rather obstinate than violent; his longing for material pleasures, though constant, is kept within bounds. A rare glutton by nature, he shows far more discrimination in his choice of food. He tends to mediocrity in everything; he understands easily enough anything not too deep or sublime. He has a love of utility and a respect for order, and knows the value of a certain amount of freedom. He is practical, in the narrowest sense of the word. He does not dream or theorize; he invents little, but can appreciate and take over what is useful to him. His whole desire is to live in the easiest and most comfortable way possible. The yellow races are thus clearly superior to the black. Every founder of a civilization would wish the backbone of his society, his middle class, to consist of such men. But no civilized society could be created by them; they could not supply its nerve-force, or set in motion the springs of beauty and action.

We come now to the white peoples. These are gifted with reflective energy, or rather with an energetic intelligence. They have a feeling for utility, but in a sense far wider and higher, more courageous and ideal, than the yellow races; a perseverance that takes account of obstacles and ultimately finds a means of overcoming them; a

greater physical power, an extraordinary instinct for order, not merely as a guarantee of peace and tranquillity, but as an indispensable means of self-preservation. At the same time, they have a remarkable, and even extreme, love of liberty, and are openly hostile to the formalism under which the Chinese are glad to vegetate, as well as to the strict despotism which is the only way of governing the negro.

The white races are, further, distinguished by an extraordinary attachment to life. They know better how to use it, and so, as it would seem, set a greater price on it; both in their own persons and those of others, they are more sparing of life. When they are cruel, they are conscious of their cruelty; it is very doubtful whether such a consciousness exists in the negro. At the same time, they have discovered reasons why they should surrender this busy life of theirs, that is so precious to them. The principal motive is honour, which under various names has played an enormous part in the ideas of the race from the beginning. I need hardly add that the word honour, together with all the civilizing influences connoted by it, is unknown to both the yellow and the black man. . . .

Such is the lesson of history. It shows us that all civilizations derive from the white race, that none can exist without its help, and that a society is great and brilliant only so far as it preserves the blood of the noble group that created it, provided that this group itself belongs to the most illustrious branch of our species.

— Reading No. 12 —

HOUSTON STEWART CHAMBERLAIN: "FOUNDATIONS OF THE NINETEENTH CENTURY"*

Houston Stewart Chamberlain (1855-1927), an English-born German writer and son-in-law of Richard Wagner, wrote Die Grundlagen des neunzehnten Jahrhunderts *in 1890-1891. The two volumes went through many editions in Germany and were translated into English in 1912 as* Foundations of the Nineteenth Century. *Praising the glories of the "Teutonic race" and "Teutonic blood," Chamberlain transformed Gobineau's artistocratic class thesis into a nationalist pattern. To Chamberlain the blond Teutonic race was the aristocracy of humanity. The following extract from Chamberlain's book contrasts the two "races"—Jews and Teutons.*

The Jews

Out of the midst of the chaos towers, like a sharply defined rock amid the formless ocean, one single people, a numerically insignificant people—the Jews. This one race has established as its guiding principle the purity of the blood; it alone possesses, therefore, physiognomy and character. If we contemplate the southern and eastern centres of culture in the world-empire in its downfall, and let no sympathies or antipathies pervert our judgment, we must confess that the Jews were at that time the

* Houston Stewart Chamberlain, *Foundations of the Nineteenth Century,* trans. by John Lees, 2 vols. (London, 1912), I, 252-257. By permission of the Bodley Head Ltd.

only people deserving respect. We may well apply to them the words of Goethe, "the faith broad, narrow the thought." In comparison with Rome and still more so with Hellas their intellectual horizon appears so narrow, their mental capacities so limited, that we seem to have before us an entirely new type of being; but the narrowness and want of originality in thought are fully counterbalanced by the power of faith, a faith which might be very simply defined as "faith in self." And since this faith in self included faith in a higher being, it did not lack ethical significance. However poor the Jewish "law" may appear, when compared with the religious creations of the various Indo-European peoples, it possessed a unique advantage in the fallen Roman Empire of that time: it was, in fact, a law; a law which men humbly obeyed, and this very obedience was bound to be of great ethical import in a world of such lawlessness. Here, as everywhere, we shall find that the influence of the Jews—for good and for evil—lies in their character, not in their intellectual achievements. Certain historians of the nineteenth century, even men so intellectually pre-eminent as Count Gobineau, have supported the view that Judaism has always had merely a disintegrating influence upon all peoples. I cannot share this conviction. In truth, where the Jews become very numerous in a strange land, they may make it their object to fulfil the promises of their Prophets and with the best will and conscience to "consume the strange peoples"; did they not say of themselves, even in the lifetime of Moses, that they were "like locusts"? However, we must distinguish between Judaism and the Jews and admit that Judaism as an idea is one of the most conservative ideas in the world. The idea of physical race-unity and race-purity, which is the very essence of Judaism, signifies the recognition of a fundamental physiological fact of life; wherever we observe life, from the hyphomycetes to the noble horse, we see the importance of "race"; Judaism made this law of nature sacred. . . .

The Teutonic Races

The entrance of the Teutonic races into the history of the world forms the counterpart to the spread of this

diminutive and yet so influential people. There, too, we see what pure race signifies, at the same time, however, what variety of races is—that great natural principle of many-sidedness, and of dissimilarity of mental gifts, which shallow, venal, ignorant babblers of the present day would fain deny, slavish souls sprung from the chaos of peoples, who feel at ease only in a confused atmosphere of characterlessness and absence of individuality. To this day these two powers—Jews and Teutonic races—stand, wherever the recent spread of the Chaos has not blurred their features, now as friendly, now as hostile, but always as alien forces face to face.

In this book I understand by "Teutonic peoples" the different North-European races, which appear in history as Celts, Teutons (Germanen) and Slavs, and from whom—mostly by indeterminable mingling—the peoples of modern Europe are descended. It is certain that they belonged originally to a single family, as I shall prove in the sixth chapter; but the Teuton in the narrower Tacitean sense of the word has proved himself so intellectually, morally and physically pre-eminent among his kinsmen, that we are entitled to make his name summarily represent the whole family. The Teuton is the soul of our culture. Europe of to-day, with its many branches over the whole world, represents the chequered result of an infinitely manifold mingling of races: what binds us all together and makes an organic unity of us is "Teutonic" blood. If we look around, we see that the importance of each nation as a living power to-day is dependent upon the proportion of genuinely Teutonic blood in its population. Only Teutons sit on the thrones of Europe.—What preceded in the history of the world we may regard as Prolegomena; true history, the history which still controls the rhythm of our hearts and circulates in our veins, inspiring us to new hope and new creation, begins at the moment when the Teuton with his masterful hand lays his grip upon the legacy of antiquity.

— Reading No. 13 —

THOMAS CARLYLE: ON THE INFERIORITY OF THE BLACK RACE*

In his notorious "Occasional Discourse on the Nigger Question," Thomas Carlyle (1795-1881) sought to demonstrate that the Negro race was inferior to the white race and that mastership and servantship presented a natural way of life. John Stuart Mill, until then Carlyle's closest friend, wrote a stinging reply to this bad-tempered defense of slavery. The arrogant Carlyle and the liberal-minded Mill ended their friendship on this issue.

The West Indies, it appears, are short of labour; as indeed is very conceivable in those circumstances. Where a Black man, by working about half an hour a day (such is the calculation), can supply himself, by aid of sun and soil, with as much pumpkin as will suffice, he is likely to be a little stiff to raise into hard work! Supply and demand, which, science says, should be brought to bear on him, have an uphill task of it with such a man. Strong sun supplies itself gratis; rich soil in those unpeopled or half-peopled regions almost gratis; these are *his* "supply;" and half an hour a day, directed upon these, will produce pumpkin, which is his "demand." The fortunate Black man, very swiftly does he settle *his* account with supply and demand:—not so swiftly the less fortunate White man of those tropical localities. A bad case, his, just now.

* Thomas Carlyle, "Occasional Discourse on the Nigger Question," in *Complete Works,* Sterling Edition (Boston, n.d.), XVI, 296-297, 316 ff. The article was first published in *Fraser's Magazine* in 1849.

He himself cannot work; and his black neighbor, rich in pumpkin, is in no haste to help him. Sunk to the ears in pumpkin, inbibing saccharine juices, and much at his ease in the Creation, he can listen to the less fortunate white man's "demand," and take his own time in supplying it. Higher wages, massa; higher, for your can-crop cannot wait; still higher,—till no conceivable opulence of can-crop will cover such wages. . . .

I never thought the "rights of Negroes" worth much discussing, nor the rights of men in any form; the grand point, as I once said, is the *mights* of men,—what portion of their "rights" they have a chance of getting sorted out, and realizes, in this confused world. . . .

West-Indian Islands, still full of waste fertility, produce abundant pumpkins: pumpkins, however, you will observe, are not the sole requisite for human well-being. No; for a pig they are the one thing needful; but for a man they are only the first of several things needful. . . . Well, all this fruit too, fruit spicy and commercial, fruit spiritual and celestial, so far beyond the merely pumpkinish and grossly terrene, lies in the West-India lands: and the ultimate "proprietorship" of them,—why, I suppose, it will vest in him who can the *best* educe from them whatever of noble produce they were created fit for yielding. He, I compute, is the real "Viceregent of the Maker" there; in him, better and better chosen, and not in another, is the "property" vested by decree of Heaven's chancery itself! . . .

— Reading No. 14 —

ROBERT KNOX: ON THE SCANDINAVIAN OR SAXON RACE*

Dr. Robert Knox (1791-1862), a British lecturer on anatomy, may be included along with Gobineau, Chamberlain, and Günther, as one of the more persistent racialists. According to Knox, "race is everything; literature, science, art, in a word, civilization, depends on it." In 1850 he published The Races of Man, *from which the following extracts praising Saxon (Anglo-Saxon) blood are taken. Knox excoriated both Jews and gypsies as under-races.*

✓ ✓ ✓

In all climes, and under all circumstances, the Saxons are a tall, powerful, athletic race of men; the strongest, as a race, on the face of the earth. They have fair hair, with blue eyes, and so fine a complexion, that they may almost be considered the only absolutely fair race on the face of the globe. Generally speaking, they are not a well-made or proportioned race, falling off most in the limbs; the torso being large, vast, and disproportioned. They are so described by Livy, and have never altered; the mistake of Prichard, and the difficulty experienced by the illustrious Niebuhr, the greatest of all historians, respecting the complexion of the *modern German* differing from the ancient, arises simply from this, that the middle and south German

* Robert Knox, *The Races of Man: A Philosophical Enquiry into the Influence of Race over the Destinies of Nations* (Philadelphia, 1950), pp. 42-47. The original edition appeared in London the same year and was reissued in a second edition in London in 1862.

belong to another race of men. They are not Scandinavians or Saxons at all, and never were. The mistake centres in the abuse of the word German; it has been applied to two or three different races: so also has the word Teuton; hence my objections to these terms. . . .

Under the influence of climate, the Saxon decays in northern America and in Australia, and he rears his offspring with difficulty. He has changed his continental locality; a physiological law, I shall shortly explain, is against his naturalization there. Were the supplies from Europe not incessant, he could not stand his ground in these new continents. A *real native* permanent American, or Australian race of pure Saxon blood, is a dream which can never be realized.

The Saxon is fair, not because he lives in a temperate or cold climate, but because he is Saxon. The Esquimaux are nearly black, yet they live amidst eternal snows; the Tasmanian is, if possible, darker than the negro, under a climate as mild as England. Climate has no influence in permanently altering the varieties or races of men; destroy them it may and does, but it cannot convert them into any other race; nor can this be done even by act of parliament, which, to a thorough-going Englishman, with all his amusing nationalities, will appear as something amazing. . . .

Thoughtful, plodding, industrious beyond all other races, a lover of labour for labour's sake; he cares not its amount if it be but profitable; large handed, mechanical, a lover of order, of punctuality in business, of neatness and cleanliness. In these qualities no race approaches him; the wealthy with him is the sole respectable, the respectable the sole good; the word comfort is never out of his mouth—it is the beau ideal of the Saxon. . . .

No race perhaps—(for I must make allowances for my Saxon descent,)—no race perhaps exceeds them in an abstract sense of justice, and a love of fair play; *but only to Saxons.* This of course they do not extend to other races. Aware of his strength of chest and arms, he uses them in self-defence: the Celt flies uniformly to the sword. To-day and to-morrow is all the Saxon looks to; yesterday he cares not for; it is past and gone. He is the man of circumstances, of expediency without method; "try all things, but do not theorize" Give me "constants,"

a book of constants; this is his cry. Hence his contempt for men of science: his hatred for genius arises from another cause; he cannot endure the idea that any man is really superior in anything to himself. The absence of genius in his race he feels; he dislikes to be told it: he attempts to crush it wherever it appears. Men of genius he calls humbugs, impostors. His literature is peculiar to himself, and must not be confounded with modern German literature: this latter is chiefly of Slavonian origin, mingled with the race occupying central Europe and stretching into Flanders.

— Reading No. 15 —

CHARLES WENTWORTH DILKE: ON THE TRIUMPH OF THE ANGLO-SAXON RACE*

In 1868, Charles Wentworth Dilke (1843-1911), a young British nobleman, published his Greater Britain, *an enthusiastic tribute to the "Anglo-Saxon race" destined to conquer the world. Here was the only "extirpating race" which must eventually displace the backward colored peoples. Following is an excerpt from the last chapter of Dilke's book.*

✓ ✓ ✓

In America we have seen the struggle of the dead races against the cheap—the endeavours of the English to hold their own against the Irish and Chinese. In New Zealand, we found the stronger and more energetic race pushing

* Sir Charles Wentworth Dilke, *Greater Britain: A Record of Travel in English-Speaking Countries* (2 vols., London, 1868), II, 405-407.

from the earth the shrewd and laborious descendants of the Asian Malays; in Australia, the English triumphant, and the cheaper races excluded from the soil not by distance merely, but by arbitrary legislation; in India, we saw the solution of the problem of officering of the cheaper by the dearer race. Everywhere we have found that the difficulties which impede the progress to universal dominion of the English people lie in the conflict with the cheaper races. The result of our survey is such as to give us reason for the belief that race distinctions will long continue, that miscegenation will go but little way towards blending races; that the dearer are, on the whole, likely to destroy the cheaper peoples, and that Saxondom will rise triumphant from the doubtful struggle.

The countries ruled by a race whose very scum and outcasts have founded empires in every portion of the globe, even now consists of 9½ millions of square miles, and contain a population of 300 millions of people. Their surface is five times as great as that of the empire of Darius, and four and a half times as large as the Roman Empire at its greatest extent. It is no exaggeration to say that in power the English countries would be more than a match for the remaining nations of the world, whom in the intelligence of their people and the extent and wealth of their dominions they already considerably surpass. Russia gains ground steadily, we are told, but so do we. If we take maps of the English-governed countries and of the Russian countries of fifty years ago, and compare them with the English and Russian countries of today, we find that the Saxon has outstripped the Muscovite in conquest and colonization. . . .

Many who are well aware of the power of the English nations are nevertheless disposed to believe that our own is morally, as well as physically, the least powerful of the sections of the race or, in other words, that we are overshadowed by America and Australia. The rise to power of our southern colonies, is however, distant, and an alliance between ourselves and America is still one to be made on equal terms. Although we are forced to contemplate the speedy loss of our manufacturing supremacy as coal becomes cheaper in America and dearer in Old England, we have nevertheless as much to bestow on

America as she has to confer on us. The possession of India offers to ourselves that element of vastness of dominion which, in this age, is needed to secure width of thought and nobility of purpose; but to the English race our possession of India, of the coasts of Africa, and of the ports of China offers the possibility of planting free institutions among the black-skinned races of the world.

The ultimate future of any one section of our race, however, is of little moment by the side of its triumph as a whole, but the power of English laws and English principles of government is not merely an English question—its continuance is essential to the freedom of mankind.

— Reading No. 16 —

JOHN ROBERT SEELEY: "THE EXPANSION OF ENGLAND"*

John Robert Seeley (1834-1895), Professor of Modern History at Cambridge University from 1869 until his death, published his famous essay, The Expansion of England, *in 1883. He denounced "Little Englandism" as synonymous with national degradation or ruin, and advocated imperial expansion as the true destiny of the Anglo-Saxon race.*

✓ ✓ ✓

I endeavoured to judge the Empire by its own intrinsic merits and to see it as it is, not concealing the inconveniencies which may attend such a vast expansion or the dangers to which it may expose us, nor finding any compensation for these in the notion that there is something intrinsically glorious in an Empire "upon which the sun never sets." . . . But though there is little that is glorious in most of the great Empires mentioned in history, since they have usually been created by force and have remained at a low level of political life, we observed that Greater Britain is not in the ordinary sense an Empire at all. Looking at the colonial part of it alone, we see a natural growth, a mere normal extension of the English race into other lands, which for the most part were so thinly peopled that our settlers took possession of them without conquest. If there is nothing highly glorious in such an expansion, there is at the same time nothing forced or unnatural about it. It creates not properly an Empire, but only a very large state. So far as the expansion itself is concerned, no one does or can regard it but with pleasure. For a nation to have an outlet for its superfluous population is one of the greatest blessings. . . .

* John Robert Seeley, *The Expansion of England: Two Courses of Lectures* (London, 1883). From the 1902 reprint, p. 295.

— Reading No. 17 —

OTTO KLINEBERG: THE AMERICAN NEGRO AND THE ENVIRONMENTAL FACTOR IN RACE*

Otto Klineberg, Professor of Psychology at Columbia University, examined the research that has been conducted in the field of race and psychology and came to

* Otto Klineberg, "Race and Psychology," in *The Race Question in Modern Science* (New York, 1956), pp. 64-69, *passim*. Courtesy of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, Paris.

these conclusions: (1) Innate racial differences in intelligence have not been demonstrated; (2) obtained differences in intelligence tests results are best explained in terms of social and educational environment; and (3) as environmental opportunities of various racial or ethnic groups become more alike, the observed differences in test results also tend to disappear. He concluded that the evidence is overwhelmingly against the view that race is a factor which determines level of intelligence.

The point of view expressed by Klineberg in the following passages was attacked by critics on the ground that it is the extreme of "statistical malpractice" to accept findings in one comparison while rejecting them in another ("to attempt to evade the unfavorable showing of the American Negro by comparing the results of tests of Negroes in Northern states with those of white persons in Southern states.")

✓ ✓ ✓

The Negro, although his position in American life has improved markedly in recent years, is still in most cases subject to very definite handicaps; his economic status is also on the average very much below that of the whites; the schools which he attends have certainly been inferior in the past, and to a certain extent are still inferior today; he finds it more difficult to obtain certain types of employment, or to participate fully in American life.

Once that is understood, it should not be surprising to find that American Indians and Negroes, adults as well as children, do on the average obtain test scores inferior to those of whites. But, it must be noted, this is a difference *on the average*. There are many *individual* Negroes who obtain scores higher than those of a great many individual whites. What is more important, there are sometimes whole groups of Negroes who do better on the tests than groups of whites with whom they have been compared.

This important fact first aroused widespread interest at the time of World War I, when over a million recruits in the American Army, including many Negroes, were given psychological tests. The results showed in the first place that Negroes from the south (where educational

and economic handicaps were greater) obtained scores which on the average were definitely inferior to those of Negroes from the north (where such handicaps, though they existed, were much less severe). Even more strikingly, the *Negroes* from some of the *northern* states turned out to be superior to the *whites* from some of the *southern* states; This was true in the case of both types of intelligence tests used, one depending on language, the other a performance or non-language test. It began to appear, at least to some psychologists, as if the color of the skin were less important in determining success with the tests, than the opportunities given to the individual to acquire the needed abilities.

Further evidence began to accumulate. Two American psychologists, Joseph Peterson and Lyle H. Lanier, became aware of the importance of comparing Negroes and whites not only in situations in which their respective environments were very different, but also in situations where their environments were approximately the same. In a study published in *Mental Measurement Monographs*, 1929, they pointed out that: 'a useful check on the reliability of a given race difference obtained in any locality and under any specific set of circumstances is to take what seem to be fairly representative samplings from widely different environments and to compare the various results as checks upon one another with a view to determining just which factors persistently yield differences in favour of one or the other race.'

In line with this reasoning, they administered a number of psychological tests to white and Negro boys in several cities, including Nashville (which is in the southern state of Tennessee, and where Negro and white children go to separate schools), and New York (where there is a unified public school system for all children). Results showed that in Nashville there was a marked superiority of the white over the Negro children, whereas in New York there was no significant difference between the two racial groups. Here again we have evidence in favour of the view that, when the environments are similar, the test results appear to be similar as well. . . .

A recent study [*was made*] of Negro and white infants at New Haven, Connecticut, . . . by a physician, Dr.

B. Pasamanick, under the direction of Professor Arnold Gesell, the famous child psychologist of Yale University. The results appeared in the *Journal of Genetic Psychology* in 1946. In this study, the Negro babies showed both a physical and mental development equal to that of the whites; the tests revealed no significant differences between the two groups. The investigator points out that as the result of the careful dietary controls introduced in the United States during the war, the Negro mothers in this group received adequate nourishment both during pregnancy and after the birth of the children, and were able to take much better care of the children. They were in fact not markedly different from the white mothers in this respect. The general economic level of the Negro group had also improved markedly as the result of the opportunities created by the development of defence industries. As a consequence, the Negro infants in this study started out, physically, on essentially equal terms with the whites. As a further consequence, they showed no inferiority or retardation in early psychological development. With equalization of the environment, we see once again, this time in babies in the first year of life, an equalization in test results.

— Reading No. 18 —

HENRY E. GARRETT: "THE EQUALITARIAN DOGMA"*

A new round in an old debate was started by Henry E. Garrett, former head of the Department of Psychology at Columbia University and a past President of the American Psychological Association, with an article titled "The Equalitarian Dogma," published in the summer of 1961. According to Garrett, the equalitarian dogma ignored or suppressed evidence of the Negro's mental and social immaturity.

* Henry E. Garrett, "The Equalitarian Dogma," in *Perspectives in Biology and Medicine*, Summer 1961. By permission of The University of Chicago Press.

✓ ✓ ✓

. . . [*The*] view that, except for environmental differences, all races are potentially equal has been called the "equalitarian dogma." (Use of the word "equalitarian" in this paper is limited to the meaning indicated above. I do not intend the broader meaning: that of belief that all men should have equal political and social rights, a concept not debated here.)

It has spread through many of our colleges and universities and is widely accepted by sincere humanitarians, social reformers, crusaders, sentimentalists and—ostensibly—politicians. Many ministers of religion, convinced that the concept of the "equality of man" is in keeping with the ideals of Christian brotherhood and democracy, have joined the social scientists. Last, but by no means least, the Communists vigorously defend the equalitarian dogma. Only the man in the street, uninstructed in social anthropology, remains puzzled and reluctant.

Equalitarianism—or egalitarianism, as it is sometimes called—finds its chief support from at least two clearly identifiable sources: the allegedly scientific groups who have "proved" equality, and the religious groups who accept this proof and, on the basis of it, assert that belief in racial differences implies "superiority" and "inferiority" and is unchristian, shameful and blameworthy.

Each camp supplements the other. The social scientists turn to moral denunciation when their evidence is feeble, and the religious fall back on "science" to bolster up their ethical preachments.

From these two directions the American people have for more than 30 years been subjected to a barrage of propaganda unrivaled in its intensity and self-righteousness. . . .

How can we account for today's shift from a general belief in native racial differences to acceptance of the equalitarian dogma?

There are, I believe, five sources which have stimulated and directed the propaganda barrage mentioned above. Let us examine these in order:

Influence of "modern" anthropology. By far the most potent assault upon native racial differences from the scientific side has come from the work of Franz Boas, who may be thought of as the "father" of the equalitarian movement.

Boas came to this country from Germany in 1886 and for 37 years—1899-1936—was professor of anthropology at Columbia University. Boas and his followers actively and aggressively championed equalitarianism, discounting any evidence tending to show that Negro-white differences may not be environmentally determined. But the cultural anthropologists rarely use objective measures recognized as valid for judging the comparative abilities of racial groups. Hence their conclusions, though confidently announced, are often subjective and unconvincing.

The view presented here is that psychological tests offer the best—i.e., most valid—quantitative data for the determination of racial differences.

The best recent survey of the comparative standing of American Negroes and American whites on a number of mental tests may be found in "Testing of Negro Intelligence," a book written by A. M. Shuey, published in 1958. It is indicative of the power—and lack of tolerance —of the equalitarians that none of the university presses to which this book was submitted was willing to publish it. This book covers 44 years, from 1913 to 1957, and analyzes some 240 studies.

Negro-white comparisons are made of preschool children, grade and high-school pupils, college students, gifted and retarded children, soldiers, delinquents, racial hybrids, and Negro migrants. A brief summary of the relevant findings follows:

1. The I.Q.'s of American Negroes are from 15 to 20 points, on the average, below those of American whites.
2. Negro overlap of white median I.Q.'s ranges from 10 to 25 per cent—equality would require 50 per cent.
3. About six times as many whites as Negroes fall in the "gifted child" category.
4. About six times as many Negroes as whites fall below 70 I.Q.—that is, in the feeble-minded group.
5. Negro-white differences in mean-test score occur in all types of mental tests, but the Negro lag is greatest in tests of an abstract nature—for example, problems involving reasoning, deduction, comprehension. These are the functions called for in education above the lowest levels.
6. Differences between Negro and white children increase with chronological age, the gap in performance being largest at the high-school and college levels.
7. Large and significant differences in favor of whites appear even when socioeconomic factors have been equated.

It seems clear that the evidence from psychometrics (intelligence testing) does not favor the equalitarian dogma; in fact, just the opposite. . . .

Hitler and the Nazis. Undoubtedly Hitler's unspeakable cruelties and the absurd racial-superiority theories of the Nazis set up a favorable climate for the proponents of the equalitarian dogma.

It is easy for the equalitarian to argue that acceptance of the *fact* of racial differences is a forerunner of notions of racial superiority, discrimination, prejudice and persecution.

The argument is fallacious. Recognition of differences in ability between men and women and between children and adults does not lead forthwith to prejudice and persecution; in fact, often the contrary is true. Recognition of the talents of many Negroes for sports and for various forms of entertainment has, if anything, improved the feelings of the white majority toward Negroes generally.

Rise of African nationalism. The struggle for freedom and self-determination by the various peoples of Africa has aroused the sympathy of most of the people of the world and has undoubtedly strengthened the emotional appeal in the idea that all men are born equally endowed.

But emotionally founded beliefs can be deceptive. As is well known, the African Negro has been self-governing throughout most of his history, the colonial period being relatively short—only 80 years in the Belgian Congo.

In the several thousand years of recorded history, the

black African has never constructed an alphabet, created a literature or a science, produced any great men, or built up a civilization.

Toynbee, the eminent British historian, has written that of the 21 great civilizations of the past, not one has been Negro. . . .

Supreme Court decision of 1954. In May of 1954, the Supreme Court of the United States handed down its decision of desegregation of the schools. This decree was hailed by proponents of the equalitarian dogma, who rightly regarded it as a great victory for their cause. Many people, however, were—and are—still confused by the issue of legal and moral rights and their relation to biological and psychological differences.

Influence of the Communists. Undoubtedly the Communists—and their supporters—have aided in the spread and acceptance of the equalitarian dogma, although the extent and the method of their aid is difficult to assess. Direct action as well as subversion are both in the Communst creed. Communists have used equalitarian dogma as a device to gain converts among underprivileged people, and also to foment trouble when possible. Many non-Communists hold the position that the free world must outdo the Communists in acceptance of this belief, and must reject any further inquiry into its validity.

It will be apparent that, in the writer's opinion, the weight of evidence is in favor of the proposition that racial differences in mental ability—and perhaps also in character—are innate and genetic. The story is not finished, and further inquiry is sorely needed.

Surely there are no scientific reasons why restrictions should be placed on further research. The equalitarian dogma, at best, represents a sincere if misguided effort to help the Negro by ignoring or even suppressing evidence of his mental and social immaturity. At worst, the equalitarian dogma is the scientific hoax of the century.

— Reading No. 19 —

CARL C. SELTZER: "THE JEW—HIS RACIAL STATUS"*

One of the most common fallacies in connection with race is use of the term "Jewish race." In this sense, race is confused with religion. Actually, there is no more a Jewish race than a Catholic race or a Buddhist race. In the concluding section of his article, "The Jew—His Racial Status," published originally in the Harvard Medical Alumni Bulletin, *Carl Coleman Seltzer, Harvard physical anthropologist, sums up the scientific attitude toward the racial status of the Jewish people.*

✓ ✓ ✓

All Jews, whether they be Ashkenazic, Sephardic or Oriental, have modified their original racial complex mainly through admixture with other racial stocks throughout the many centuries in the different regions of the Old World. It is my opinion that whatever physical changes the Jews have been subjected to, those of environmental origin are of very minor consequence compared to the effect brought about through actual commingling with alien racial strains. Today the Ashkenazic Jews display the whole gamut of mixed racial strains that are also present in the Gentile populations of the same European areas, with the supplementary factor, however, that underlying all these conglomerate mixtures there still remains a small Mediterranean and Iranian Plateau remnant of the original racial characters of the

* Carl C. Seltzer, "The Jew—His Racial Status," *Harvard Medical Alumni Bulletin,* April 1939, pp. 10-11. By permission of the publisher.

formative period of Jewish history in Palestine. And finally the Jews who are today settled in the United States are principally derived from the Ashkenazic branch of the Jewish people, with only very slight additions of their co-religionists of Sephardic extraction.

Are the Jews as a whole physically distinctive from the Gentiles and do they form a "Jewish Race," in the strictly anthropological sense? It is a matter of common observation that the majority of Jews can be selected from our American population by the man in the street apparently on the basis of physical appearance. There seems to be some sort of quality of looking Jewish which is very difficult to analyze even for the anthropologist. However, there are some factors which are relatively clear. No matter what racial blends the various groups of Jewish people are composed of, virtually all possess a small remnant of Mediterranean and Iranian Plateau blood. In some Jewish people these strains are stronger than in others. The physical expression of the Iranian Plateau element is this dominant nasality. It is this very high, prominent, usually convex nose, with a thick and quite often depressed tip, and flaring and recurved nostrils, which has persisted among the Jews at the expense of other forms less distinctive. . . .

Can we say then that there is such a thing as the "Jewish Race"? The answer is definitely no. In the anthropological meaning of the word "race," it can be said with conviction that the Jewish people, taken as a whole, show no preponderance, nor consistency, nor exclusiveness of physical features which allow them to be classified as a unified racial group. They are a conglomerate mixture of many races in disparate proportions bound together by common religion, familial, and historical traditions, but showing in many instances varying amounts of physical distinctiveness. We can no more classify the Jews into a race than we can say that there is an American race with its mixture of people of British, Irish, Scandinavian, French, Italian, Greek and other extractions.

— Reading No. 20 —

HEINRICH VON TREITSCHKE: RACIALISM AND NATIONALISM*

The most influential of the Prussian school of professor-prophets (Droysen, Sybel, Treitschke) who sought to work politically through history ("durch die Geschichte politisch zu wirken") *was Heinrich von Treitschke (1834-1896). In confusing racialism with nationalism, as indicated in the following passage from his* History of Germany in the Nineteenth Century *(published from 1879 on), Treitschke gave strong impetus to anti-Semitism in Germany. His cry "The Jews are our misfortune!" became a popular slogan among German anti-Semites.*

✓ ✓ ✓

The new radicalism found a powerful ally in the youthful energy of literary Judaism. Modern Jewry had long ceased to possess sufficient intellectual energy to generate a sound culture of its own, as had been possible centuries before to the Jews who lived amid the oriental civilisation of the Moorish empire in Spain. The old civilisations of western Europe possessed so definite a national stamp that in politics and literature the Jews could not venture to display themselves as an independent force. Thus the first German Jew to attain a notable position in our literature, Moses Mendelssohn, followed the current of German national life, helping to the best

* Heinrich von Treitschke, *History of Germany in the Nineteenth Century*, trans. by Eden and Cedar Paul (7 vols., New York, 1915-1919), IV, 554-555. Courtesy of Robert M. McBride & Co.

of his ability in the intellectual tasks of the German philosophy of enlightenment. When he defended the faith of his fathers against Lavater, as he was well entitled to do, it was by no means his intention to permeate the German world with Jewish ideas, and he was far more concerned to diffuse German culture among his co-religionists. Since then, the seed he had sown had ripened, a number of the Jews had become more or less Germanised, and several Jewish writers were already regular contributors to the newspaper press; but in these circles there soon began to prevail a dangerous spirit of aloofness and arrogance. In Germany the Jewish population was far more numerous than in other countries of western Europe. . . .

The finer spirits among the German Jews had long recognised that members of their race could not claim civic equality unless they were prepared to abandon a separatist position and to participate unreservedly in German life. A few decades after Moses Mendelssohn had issued his appeal, talented men of Jewish descent, baptised and unbaptised, men who felt themselves to be Germans and whose work displayed thoroughly German lineaments, had acquired distinguished positions in art and science: in music, Felix Mendelssohn-Bartholdy; in painting, Veit; and in theology, the simple-minded and pious Neander. But in contrast with these, the crude Jewish geniuses whose pens found a market in the columns of the daily press boldly insisted on the display of Jewish peculiarities, while simultaneously demanding respect as spokesmen of German public opinion. These Jews without a country, vaunting themselves as a nation within the nation, exercised upon the still inchoate national self-esteem of the Germans an influence no less disturbing and disintegrating than similar Jews had exercised of old upon the declining nations of the Roman empire.

— Reading No. 21 —

RICHARD WAGNER: RACIALISM AND ANTI-SEMITISM *

Richard Wagner (1813-1883), described by Thomas Mann as "the supreme symbol of the nineteenth century," devoted his career to the fusion of music and dramatic poetry. At the same time he sought to give expression to what he called the Germanic hero-spirit, a "racial characteristic" he believed to be possessed only by the "pure-bred Germanic branches of the Aryan race." In its early form Wagner's anti-Semitism had been more cultural than racial, but in 1881 he emerged as Germany's foremost racialist, as the champion of the "unconscious race force" that would end Germany's woes, provided that the race-force was purified. The following selections from Wagner's prolific writings reveal the composer's highly emotional racialism. Adolf Hitler, who regarded Wagner as a true Germanic Hero, was strongly influenced by such ideas as revealed here.

I. Richard Wagner on the Antagonism of Races

[From "Know Thyself," in *Bayreuther Blätter*, February-March 1881.]

Our nation, one may say, has not the natural instinct for that which suits it, for what becomes it, helps and furthers it; estranged from itself, it dabbles in foreign manners. On none other have great and original spirits been bestowed, as on it, without its having known in

* *Richard Wagner's Prose Works*, trans. by William Ashton Ellis (8 vols., London, 1897), I—Vol. 6, pp. 269-271; II—Vol. 3, pp. 84-85.

time to treasure them: yet if the silliest news-writer or political cheap-jack but brazens out his lying phrases, it chooses him to represent its weightiest interests; whilst if the Jew comes tinkling with his bell of paper, it throws its savings at his feet, and makes him in one night a millionaire.

The Jew, on the contrary, is the most astounding instance of racial congruence ever offered by world-history. Without a fatherland, a mother-tongue, amidst every people's land and tongue he finds himself again, in virtue of the unfailing instinct of his absolute and indelible idiosyncrasy: even commixture of blood does not hurt him; let Jew or Jewess intermarry with the most distinct of races, a Jew will always come to birth. Not into the remotest contact is he brought with the religion of any of the civilised (*gesittete*) nations; for in truth he has no religion at all—merely the belief in certain promises of his god which in nowise extend to a life beyond this temporal life of his, as in every true religion, but simply to this present life on earth, whereon his race is certainly ensured dominion over all that lives and lives not. Thus the Jew has need to neither think nor chatter, not even to calculate, for the hardest calculation lies all cut and dried for him in an instinct shut against all ideality.

II. Richard Wagner on "Jewish Sounds"

The Jew speaks the language of the nation in whose midst he dwells from generation to generation, but he always speaks it as an alien. Our whole European art and civilization have remained to the Jew a foreign tongue. In this speech, this art, the Jew can only after-speak and after-patch—not truly make a poem of his words, an artwork of his doings. In the peculiarities of Semitic pronunciation the first thing that strikes our ear as quite outlandish and unpleasant, in the Jew's production of the voice-sounds, is a creaking, squeaking, buzzing snuffle (*ein zischender, schrillender, summsender und murksender Lautausdruck*). This mode of speaking acquires at once the character of an intolerably jumbled blabber (*eines unerträglich verwirrten Geplappers*). The cold indifference of his peculiar blubber (*Gelabber*) never by chance rises to the ardor of a higher heartfelt passion.

— Reading No. 22 —

ADOLF HITLER: PEOPLE AND RACE*

The first volume of Adolf Hitler's Mein Kampf *was published in June 1925. This book eventually became the bible of the Nazi movement. In stormy, violent, and vulgar prose ("In the whole book hardly a single actual fact is related tangibly and credibly"—Konrad Heiden), Hitler elaborated the ideas of nation, state, and race in the pattern already set by Count Arthur de Gobineau and Houston Stewart Chamberlain. Here were the emotionalized outpourings of an uneducated man anxious to prove the undesirability of formal education and the necessity of "common sense." The book went through hundreds of editions in Germany and millions were sold (the title page of the edition used here refers to the 805-809th printing and a total sale of 9,740,000 copies). Following are extracts showing Hitler's concept of* "Volk und Rasse" *("People and Race").*

✓ ✓ ✓

There are certain truths that exist right in front of our eyes but, nevertheless, are not seen by ordinary people or at least not recognized. These people evade such truths as if blind and they are astonished when suddenly someone discovers that which everyone should have known all along. Hundreds of thousands saw the egg of Columbus, but there were few Columbuses around.

Thus human beings universally wander around in the garden of nature, and with few exceptions are blind to the conspicuous foundations of their existence: the inner secrets of their way of life on this earth. . . .

History has shown with terrible clarity that each time Aryan blood has become mixed with inferior peoples the

* Adolf Hitler, *Mein Kampf* (Munich, 1943), pp. 311 ff. and 437 ff.

result has been the end of the culture-sustaining race. North America, whose people for the most part stem from Germanic elements, reveals quite a different human nature and culture from Central and South America, where the dominantly romantic immigrants mingled racially with the original inhabitants. Here one can recognize clearly the working of race mixture. The Germans of the American continent who remained pure and unmixed were able to rise to a position of supremacy. They will remain masters as long as they do not descend to the shame of blood bastardization.

The result of every racial crossing, to put it briefly, is always as follows:

a) sinking of the standard of the higher race;

b) physical and mental deterioration and the beginning of a slow but certain and progressive chronic ill-health. . . .

And here, of course, comes the insolent but at the same time stupidly Jewish objection of the modern pacifist: "Man is able to rise above nature!"

Millions of people babble this Jewish nonsense and really convince themselves that they can overcome the forces of nature. . . .

All that we admire on this earth—science, art, technical skill and invention—is the creative product of only a small number of nations, and originally, perhaps, of one single race. All this culture depends on them for its very existence. If these nations are ruined, they carry with them all the beauty of this earth into the grave. . . .

All great cultures of the past have gone on to destruction because the original creative race died of blood poisoning.

Always it has been the same thing—the final cause for such destruction came from the error that all culture is independent of man, when just the opposite is true—creative man must guard his own culture.

This point of view is bound up with the iron law of necessity and the law of victory for the best and the strongest.

Who wants to live also must fight, and he who does not want to fight in this world does not deserve to live. . . .

The man who knows the laws of race and pays no

attention to them . . . hinders the triumph of the best races as well as all human progress. He joins the sphere . . . of the helpless beasts. . . .

If mankind were to be divided into three categories, into founders, maintainers, and destroyers of culture, the Aryan stock alone would represent the first category of founders. From them come the fundamentals of all human creative effort. . . .

— Reading No. 23 —

ALFRED ROSENBERG: "THE MYTH OF THE TWENTIETH CENTURY"*

Alfred Rosenberg (1893-1946), prophet-laureate of National Socialism, first published The Myth of the Twentieth Century *in 1930. By 1938 the book had run into 142 editions and had sold 713,000 copies. For Rosenberg the myth of the twentieth century was "the myth of Blood, which under the sign of the swastika unchained the racial world-revolution." "It is the awakening of the race-soul, which after long sleep victoriously ends the race-chaos."* The Myth *is a racial view of history, in contrast with the socio-economic interpretations usually made of the French and Russian world-revolutions. The following brief excerpts give an indication of the style of Rosenberg's writing and thinking.*

A new epoch begins today in which world history will be written anew. The old conceptions of the human past

* Alfred Rosenberg, *Der Mythus des 20. Jahrhunderts* (39-40th edition, Munich, 1934), pp. 21-23, 116-118, and *passim.*

have faded away. . . . A young but ancient feeling of life demands expression, a world view is born. . . .

A new and colorful picture of human and earthly history is beginning to be unveiled today, if we recognize honorably that we must investigate the division between blood and milieu, between blood and blood. But this recognition also includes the knowledge that the struggle of bloods and the mysticism of life are not two different things, but one and the same thing. Race is the symbolic expression of a soul. Racial virtue has a value in itself. . . .

Racial history is equivalent to natural history and the mystical soul. The history of the religion of the blood is the story of the rise and fall of peoples, of their heroes and thinkers, their inventors and artists. . . .

A cultured nation will concede to no one the right to judge its creations, by censuring them as good or bad, right or wrong. . . .

Each race has its soul, and each soul belongs to a race. . . . Each race produces in the long run only one supreme ideal. . . . This supreme value demands a definite grouping of the other life-values, which are conditioned by it. It thus determines the character of a race, of a people. . . .

If we tolerate, at the same time, and in the same place, two or more world-outlooks, each one related to a different supreme value, which the *same* people are to share . . . we have sown the germs of a new catastrophe. . . .

History no longer means war of class against class nor of church dogma and dogma, but blood and blood, race and race. . . .

Soul means race, inwardly discerned. Conversely, race is the external aspect of a soul. . . .

Nordic blood represents that mystery which has replaced and overcome the old Sacraments. . . .

The race-bound national soul is the measure of all our thoughts, aspirations of will and deeds, the final criterion of our values. . . .

The foibles of our heroes ought not to be glossed over, but the eternal, the mythical, behind them ought to be intuited and formulated by the questing soul. In this very way there will arise a series of heroic spirits: Odin,

Siegfried, Widukind, Frederick II (the Hohenstaufen), Eckehart, Von der Vogelweide, Luther, Frederick the Great, Bach, Goethe, Beethoven, Schopenhauer, Bismarck. . . . To serve this new evolution is the mission of the school in the coming German *Reich*. It is its most important if not its only task in the decades to come to make the new evaluation self-evident to all Germans.

— Reading No. 24 —

VENERATION OF THE BLOOD: NAZI INTELLECTUALS ON RACE PURITY*

The myth of race purity (Rassenreinheit) *descended to irrationalism in Nazi Germany, as witness the following examples from speeches and writings of "intellectuals" in the Third Reich. "The blood substance of the Germanic race" was praised as a "pre-eminent and unique asset of the world as a whole."*

Blood is sacred. It contains, from ancient times, the generating mystery of families, tribes and peoples. . . . The origin of the spirit is in the blood. There is a Divine power in the blood which forms human beings in conformity with their predestined patterns. . . . It thus comes about that we so ardently love blood and soil and fatherland and the history of our people with all its struggles, that we profoundly worship all this because God himself meets us here, materialized and immediate.

PROFESSOR ERNST HAUER

* Quoted in N. Gangulee, ed., *The Mind and Face of Nazi Germany* (London, 1942), pp. 56 ff.

The veneration of the blood is not a purely German idea of our age. It is as old as humanity. The worship of ancestors is part of the cult of the ancient Chinese, Americans, Africans and other peoples. . . . It is not possible to build up a German-Nordic religion if one omits or rejects the sacred preservation of the blood. *Our religion must correspond to the inheritance of our people* or it will be alien and enforced. Conversely, this means that those who do not share this heritage, those of alien blood, will not be equally receptive to the Nordic religion. For example, a Jew or non-Aryan, however diligent with his religious schooling and however much convinced that he has become assimilated to us, deceives himself and us. The alien element will break out, in criticism or habits or some other form. Hence it is for us a sacred duty to see to it in our family that no member of it by marriage of alien race weakens or spoils our German blood. Nor can sacred German blood be allowed to become diseased by marriage with the mentally inferior. Compulsory sterilization by the Government is rooted and established in the religion of our people.

FELIX FISCHER-DODELEBEN

Only the Nordic race can be expected successfully to control Jewish influence in culture and industrial life because it is—as the Christian religion is not—race-conscious.

Then a strengthening of Nordic humanity will take place in those lands from which our race originated, namely all over Northern Central-Europe. The union of all Nordic persons and peoples is the final moral duty of the Nordic racial community. Only when this is achieved will the danger of the downfall of creative Nordic Man be banished.

DR. WILHELM KUSSEROW

Blood is the builder of the boy, and also the source of the spirit of the race. In blood lurks our ancestral inheritance; in blood is embodied the race; from blood arise the character and destiny of man. Blood is to man the hidden undercurrent, the symbol of the current of life

from which man can arise and ascend to the regions of light, of spirit and of knowledge.

DR. E. KRIECK: *Nationalpolitische Erziehung,* 1933

The Jews reject everything that pertains to the pig. The Nordic peoples, on the contrary, accord the pig the highest possible honour. In the ancient cult of the Germans the pig occupies the first place and is regarded as the first among the domestic animals. . . . This special honour to the pig, the sacred animal destined to become symbolic sacrifice among the Nordic peoples, has drawn its originality from the great trees of the German forest. . . . Thus out of the darkness of earliest history arise two human races whose attitude in respect of pigs presents an absolute contrast. . . . The Semites and the pig are faunal and thus physiological opposites. It is not unthinkable that the eating of pig flesh by the Semite sets up physiological disharmonies in his body. . . . The Semites do not understand the pig; whereas this animal occupies the first place in the cult of the Nordic peoples.

WALTER DARRÉ, 1933

— Reading No. 25 —

HERMAN GAUCH: NORDICS AND NON-NORDICS*

In the Nazi Third Reich, Rassenkunde (*study of race*) *and* Rassenforschung (*racial research*) *were elevated to the position of respectable "sciences." A standard work was* Neue Grundlagen der Rassenforschung (New Bases

* Hermann Gauch, *Neue Grundlagen der Rassenforschung* (Berlin, n.d.), pp. 165-166.

of Racial Research), *in which Professor Hermann Gauch reclassified the animal world into Nordic men and lower animals (Jews).*

✓ ✓ ✓

In non-Nordics, the teeth, corresponding to the snout-like narrowness of the upper jaw, stand at a more oblique angle than in animals. The grinding motion of chewing in Nordics allows mastication to take place with the mouth closed, whereas men of other races are inclined to make the same smacking noise as animals. . . .

The Nordic mouth has further superiorities. Just as the color red has a stirring effect, the bright red mouth of Nordics attracts and provokes kisses and courtship. The Nordic mouth is kiss-capable. On the other hand, the non-Nordic's broad, thick-lipped mouth together with his wide-dilated nostrils displays sensual eagerness, a false and malicious sneering expression and a dipping movement indicative of voluptuous self-indulgence.

Talking with the aid of hands and feet is characteristic of non-Nordics, whereas the Nordic man stands calmly, often enough with his hands in his pockets.

Generally speaking, the Nordic race alone can emit sounds of untroubled clearness, whereas among non-Nordics the pronunciation is impure, the individual sounds are more confused and like the noises made by animals, such as barking, sniffing, snoring, squeaking. . . . That birds can learn to talk better than other animals is explained by the fact that their mouths are Nordic in structure—that is to say, high, narrow, and short-tongued. The shape of the Nordic gum allows a superior movement of the tongue, which is the reason why Nordic talking and singing are fuller. . . .

If non-Nordics are more closely allied to monkeys and apes than to Nordics, why is it possible for them to mate with Nordics and not with apes? The answer is this: it has not been proved that non-Nordics cannot mate with apes.

— Reading No. 26 —

THE NUREMBERG LAWS ON CITIZENSHIP AND RACE, SEPTEMBER-NOVEMBER, 1935 *

The most spectacular and immediate consequence of the Nazi triumph was the reign of anti-Semitism. From September to November, 1935, Hitler introduced the so-called Nuremberg, or Ghetto Laws, which gave legality to the practice of anti-Semitism. This was the first time in history that racial prejudice and intolerance were deliberately incorporated into the laws of a nation.

✓ ✓ ✓

I. The Reich Citizenship Law of September 15, 1935

The Reichstag has adopted by unanimous vote the following law which is herewith promulgated.

ARTICLE 1. (1) A subject of the State is one who belongs to the protective union of the German Reich, and who, therefore, has specific obligations to the Reich.

(2) The status of subject is to be acquired in accordance with the provisions of the Reich and the State Law of Citizenship.

ARTICLE 2. (1) A citizen of the Reich may be only that subject who is of German or kindred blood, and who, through his behavior, shows that he is both desirous and personally fit to serve loyally the German people and the Reich. . . .

ARTICLE 3. The Reich Minister of the Interior, in conjunction with the Deputy to the *Fuehrer* will issue the

* *Reichsgesetzblatt,* 1935, No. 100, September 15, 1935, I: 1142-47.

required legal and administrative decrees for the implementation and amplification of this law.

Promulgated: September 16, 1935.

In force: September 30, 1935.

II. The Law for the Protection of German Blood and Honor, September 15, 1935

Imbued with the knowledge that the purity of German blood is the necessary prerequisite for the existence of the German nation, and inspired by an inflexible will to maintain the existence of the German nation for all future times, the Reichstag has unanimously adopted the following law, which is now proclaimed:

ARTICLE 1. (1) Any marriages between Jews and citizens of German or kindred blood are herewith forbidden. Marriages entered into despite this law are invalid, even if they are arranged abroad as a means of circumventing this law.

(2) Annulment proceedings for marriages may be initiated only by the Public Prosecutor.

ARTICLE 2. Extramarital relations between Jews and citizens of German or kindred blood are herewith forbidden.

ARTICLE 3. Jews are forbidden to employ as servants in their households female subjects of German or kindred blood who are under the age of 45 years.

ARTICLE 4. (1) Jews are prohibited from displaying the Reich and national flag and from showing the national colors.

(2) However, they may display the Jewish colors. The exercise of this right is under State protection.

ARTICLE 5. (1) Anyone who acts contrary to the prohibition noted in Article 1 renders himself liable to penal servitude.

(2) The man who acts contrary to the prohibition of Article 2 will be punished by sentence to either a jail or penitentiary.

(3) Anyone who acts contrary to the provisions of Articles 3 and 4 will be punished with a jail sentence up to a year and with a fine, or with either of these penalties.

ARTICLE 6. The Reich Minister of Interior, in conjunction with the Deputy to the *Fuehrer* and the Reich Minister of Justice, will issue the required legal and administrative decrees for the implementation and amplification of this law.

ARTICLE 7. This law shall go into effect on the day following its promulgation, with the exception of Article 3, which shall go into effect on January 1, 1936.

— Reading No. 27 —

JOSIAH STRONG: THE ANGLO-SAXON DESTINY*

Racialists in all the major countries argued that it was the destiny of their own "master race" to dominate "backward" races. In the United States, Josiah Strong (1847-1916), a Congregationalist minister, insisted that it was the historic mission of the "Anglo-Saxon race" to carry the ideals of civil liberty and spiritual Christianity to remote peoples of the earth.

Every race which has deeply impressed itself on the human family has been the representative of some great idea—one or more—which has given direction to the nation's life and form to its civilization. Among the Egyptians this seminal idea was life, among the Persians it was light, among the Hebrews it was purity, among the Greeks it was beauty, among the Romans it was law. The Anglo-Saxon is the representative of two great ideas, which are closely related. One of them is that of civil liberty. Nearly all of the civil liberty in the world is enjoyed by Anglo-

* Josiah Strong, *Our Country* (New York, 1885), pp. 159-179, *passim*.

Saxons: the English, the British colonists, and the people of the United States. . . .

The other great idea . . . is that of a pure *spiritual* Christianity. . . . That means that most of the spiritual Christianity in the world is found among Anglo-Saxons and their converts; for this is the great missionary race. . . .

It follows, then, that the Anglo-Saxon, as the great representative of these two ideas, the depository of these two greatest blessings, sustains peculiar relations to the world's future, is divinely commissioned to be, in a peculiar sense, his brother's keeper. . . .

. . . Another marked characteristic of the Anglo-Saxon is what may be called an instinct or genius for colonizing. His unequaled energy, his indomitable perseverence, and his personal independence, made him a pioneer. He excels all others in pushing his way into new countries. It was those in whom this tendency was strongest that came to America, and this inherited tendency has been further developed by the westward sweep of successive generations across the continent. So noticeable has this characteristic become that English visitors remark it. Charles Dickens once said that the typical American would hesitate to enter heaven unless assured that he could go further west. . . .

It seems to me that God, with infinite wisdom and skill, is training the Anglo-Saxon race for an hour sure to come in the world's future. . . .

— Reading No. 28 —

ALBERT J. BEVERIDGE: ON THE MISSION OF THE AMERICAN "RACE"*

In 1900, Albert Jeremiah Beveridge (1826-1927), Senator from Indiana, presented with emotional oratory the case for American annexation of the Philippines. In justification, Senator Beveridge spoke of "the mission of our race, trustee under God, of the civilization of the world." The Filipinos, he said, were not "a self-governing race." Selections from his speech before the Senate reveal the close connection between racialism and imperialism.

✓ ✓ ✓

Mr. President, I address the Senate at this time because Senators and Members of the House on both sides have asked that I give to Congress and the country my observations in the Philippines and the Far East, and the conclusions which those observations compel; and because of hurtful resolutions introduced and utterances made in the Senate, every word of which will cost and is costing the lives of American soldiers.

Mr. President, the times call for candor. The Philippines are ours forever, "territory belonging to the United States," as the Constitution calls them. And just beyond the Philippines are China's illimitable markets. We will not repudiate our duty in the archipelago. We will not abandon our opportunity in the Orient. We will not renounce our part in the mission of our race, trustee, under God, of the civilization of the world. And we will move

* Congressional Record, XXXIII, Part I, January 9, 1900, pp. 704-705, 707.

forward to our work, not howling out regrets like slaves whipped to their burdens, but with gratitude for a task worthy of our strength, and thanksgiving to Almighty God that He has marked us as His chosen people, henceforth to lead in the regeneration of the world. . . .

Mr. President, this question is deeper than any question of party politics; deeper than any question of the isolated policy of our country even; deeper even than any question of constitutional power. It is elemental. It is racial. God has not been preparing the English-speaking and Teutonic peoples for a thousand years for nothing but vain and idle self-contemplation and self-admiration. No! He has made us the master organizers of the world to establish system where chaos reigns. He has given us the spirit of progress to overwhelm the forces of reaction throughout the earth. He has made us adept in government that we may administer government among savage and senile peoples. Were it not for such a force as this the world would relapse into barbarism and night. And of all our race He has marked the American people as His chosen nation to finally lead in the regeneration of the world. This is the divine mission of America, and it holds for us all the profit, all the glory, all the happiness possible to man. We are trustees of the world's progress, guardians of its righteous peace. . . .

[*Our*] flag has never paused in its onward march. Who dares halt it now—now, when history's largest events are carrying it forward; now, when we see at last one people, strong enough for any task, great enough for any glory destiny can bestow? . . .

And so, Senators, with reverent hearts, where dwells the fear of God, the American people move forward to the future of their hope and the doing of His work. . . .

— Reading No. 29 —

MADISON GRANT: THE RACIAL BASIS OF EUROPEAN HISTORY*

In 1916 Madison Grant (1865-1937), lawyer and anthropologist, wrote The Passing of a Great Race, or The Racial Basis of European History, *in which he denounced the mixture of races. In the following passage from his book Grant defended use of the cephalic index as a means of determining race.*

The use of . . . the cephalic index, enables us to divide the great bulk of the European populations into three distinct subspecies of man, one northern and one southern, both dolichocephalic or characterized by a long skull, and a central subspecies which is brachycephalic, or characterized by a round skull.

The first is the Nordic or Baltic subspecies. This race is long skulled, very tall, fair skinned, with blond or brown hair and light colored eyes. The Nordics inhabit the countries around the North and Baltic Seas, and include not only the great Scandinavian and Teutonic groups, but also other early peoples who first appear in southern Europe and in Asia as representatives of Aryan language and culture.

The second is the dark Mediterranean or Iberian subspecies, occupying the shores of the inland sea, and ex-

* Madison Grant, *The Passing of the Great Race, or The Racial Basis of European History* (New York, 1916), pp. 14-19. Published by Charles Scribner's Sons. By permission of Mrs. D. G. Brinton Thompson, owner of the copyright.

tending along the Atlantic coast until it reaches the Nordic species. It also spreads far east into southern Asia. It is long skulled like the Nordic race, but the absolute size of the skull is less. The eyes and hair are very dark or black, and the skin more or less swarthy. The stature is stunted in comparison to that of the Nordic race and the musculature and bony framework weak.

The third is the Alpine subspecies occupying all central and eastern Europe, and extending through Asia Minor to the Hindu Kush and the Pamirs. The Armenoids constitute an Alpine subdivision and represent the ancestral type of this race which remained in the mountains and high plateaux of Anatolia and western Asia. The Alpines are round skulled, of medium height and sturdy build, both as to skeleton and muscles. The coloration of both hair and eyes was originally very dark and still tends strongly in that direction, but many light colored eyes, especially gray, are now found in the Alpine population of western Europe.

While the inhabitants of Europe betray as a whole their mixed origin, nevertheless the three main subspecies are each found in large numbers and in great purity, as well as sparse remnants of still more ancient races represented by small groups or by individuals, and even by unit characters.

These three main groups have bodily characters which constitute them distinct subspecies of *Homo sapiens*. Each has several varieties, but for the sake of clearness the word race and not the word species or subspecies will hereafter be used nearly, but not quite, exclusively. In zoology the term species implies the existence of a certain definite amount of divergence from the most closely related type, but race does not require a similar amount of difference. In man, where all groups are more or less fertile when crossed, so many intermediate or mixed types occur that the word species has too limited a meaning for wide use. Related species when grouped together constitute subgenera and genera.

— Reading No. 30 —

LOTHROP STODDARD: "THE IRON LAW OF INEQUALITY"*

One of the most prolific apostles of Nordicism in the United States was Theodore Lothrop Stoddard (1883-1950), lawyer and publicist. In one of his books, Revolt Against Civilization: The Menace of the Under-Man *(1922), Stoddard argued that the idea of natural equality of races was one of the most pernicious delusions that ever afflicted mankind. He warned that influx of the "Under-Man" (the inferior races) was an unmitigated disaster. Following is Stoddard's interpretation of what he called "the iron law of inequality."*

✓ ✓ ✓

The idea of "Natural Equality" is one of the most pernicious delusions that has ever afflicted mankind. It is a figment of the human imagination. Nature knows no equality. The most cursory examination of natural phenomena reveals the presence of a Law of Inequality as universal and inflexible as the Law of Gravitation. The evolution of life is the most striking instance of this fundamental truth. Evolution is a process of differentiation—of increasing differentiation—from the simple one-celled bit of protoplasm to the infinitely differentiated, complex life forms of the present day.

And the evolutionary process is not merely quantitative;

* Lothrop Stoddard, *The Revolt Against Civilization: The Menace of the Under-Man* (New York, 1922), pp. 30-32. Published by Charles Scribner's Sons. By permission of Mrs. Nicholas von Richter, owner of the copyright.

it is qualitative as well. These successive differentiations imply increasing inequalities. Nobody but a madman could seriously contend that the microscopic speck of protoplasmic jelly floating in the tepid waters of the Palæozoic Sea was "equal" to a human being.

But this is only the beginning of the story. Not only are the various life types profoundly unequal in qualities and capacities; the individual members of each type are similarly differentiated among themselves. No two individuals are ever precisely alike. We have already seen how greatly this dual process of differentiation both of type and individual has affected the human species, and how basic a factor it has been in human progress.

Furthermore, individual inequalities steadily increase as we ascend the biological scale. The amœba differs very little from his fellows; the dog much more so; man most of all. And inequalities between men likewise become ever more pronounced. The innate differences between members of a low-grade savage tribe are as nothing compared with the abyss sundering the idiot and the genius who coexist in a high-grade civilization.

Thus, we see that evolution means a process of ever-growing inequality. There is, in fact, no such word as "equality" in nature's lexicon. With an increasingly uneven hand she distributes health, beauty, vigor, intelligence, genius—all the qualities which confer on their possessors superiority over their fellows.

Now, in the face of all this, how has the delusion of "natural equality" obtained—and retained—so stubborn a hold on mankind? As to both its antiquity and persistency there can be no shadow of doubt. The slogan of "equality" was raised far back in the remote past, and, instead of lessening, was never more loudly trumpeted than to-day. It is a curious fact that just when the advance of knowledge and the increasing complexity of civilization have enhanced individual differences and rendered superior capacities supremely important, the cry for equality should have become fiercer than ever, should have been embodied in all sorts of levelling doctrines, and should have been actually attempted in Bolshevik Russia with the most fanatical fury and the most appalling results.

— Reading No. 31 —

THE UNESCO STATEMENT OF 1950 ON RACE*

The first Statement on race by the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, UNESCO, was published on July 18, 1950, after specialists in the natural and social sciences had thoroughly discussed the problem. Following is the full text of the 1950 Statement.

1. Scientists have reached general agreement in recognizing that mankind is one: that all men belong to the same species, *Homo sapiens*. It is further generally agreed among scientists that all men are probably derived from the same common stock; and that such differences as exist between different groups of mankind are due to the operation of evolutionary factors or differentiation such as isolation, the drift and random fixation of the material particles which control heredity (the genes), changes in the structure of these particles, hybridization, and natural selection. In these ways groups have arisen of varying stability and degree of differentiation which have been classified in different ways for different purposes.

2. From the biological standpoint, the species *Homo sapiens* is made up of a number of populations, each one of which differs from the others in the frequency of one or more genes. Such genes, responsible for the hereditary differences between men, are always few when compared to the whole genetic constitution of man and to the vast

* United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, *The Race Concept: Results of an Inquiry* (Paris, 1951), pp. 89-94. Courtesy of UNESCO, Paris.

number of genes common to all human beings regardless of the population to which they belong. This means that the likenesses among men are far greater than their differences.

3. A race, from the biological standpoint, may therefore be defined as one of the group of populations constituting the species *Homo sapiens*. These populations are capable of interbreeding with one another but, by virtue of the isolating barriers which in the past kept them more or less separated, exhibit certain physical differences as a result of their somewhat different biological histories. These represent variations, as it were, on a common theme.

4. In short, the term 'race' designates a group or population characterized by some concentrations, relative as to frequency and distribution, of hereditary particles (genes) or physical characters, which appear, fluctuate, and often disappear in the course of time by reason of geographic and/or cultural isolation. The varying manifestations of these traits in different populations are perceived in different ways by each group. What is perceived is largely preconceived, so that each group arbitrarily tends to misinterpret the variability which occurs as a fundamental difference which separates that group from all others.

5. These are the scientific facts. Unfortunately, however, when most people use the term 'race' they do not do so in the sense above defined. To most people, a race is any group of people whom they choose to describe as a race. Thus, many national, religious, geographic, linguistic or cultural groups have, in such loose usage, been called 'race', when obviously Americans are not a race, nor are Englishmen, nor Frenchmen, nor any other national group. Catholics, Protestants, Moslems and Jews are not races, nor are groups who speak English or any other language thereby definable as a race; people who live in Iceland or England or India are not races; nor are people who are culturally Turkish or Chinese or the like thereby describable as races.

6. National, religious, geographic, linguistic and cultural groups do not necessarily coincide with racial groups; and the cultural traits of such groups have no demonstrated genetic connexion with racial traits. Because serious errors of this kind are habitually committed when the term 'race' is used in popular parlance, it would be better when speaking of human races to drop the term 'race' altogether and speak of *ethnic groups*.

7. Now what has the scientist to say about the groups of mankind which may be recognized at the present time? Human races can be and have been differently classified by different anthropologists, but at the present time most anthropologists agree on classifying the greater part of present-day mankind into three major divisions, as follows: the Mongoloid Division, the Negroid Division, the Caucasoid Division. The biological processes which the classifier has here embalmed, as it were, are dynamic, not static. These divisions were not the same in the past as they are at present, and there is every reason to believe that they will change in the future.

8. Many sub-groups or ethnic groups within these divisions have been described. There is no general agreement upon their number, and in any event most ethnic groups have not yet been either studied or described by the physical anthropologists.

9. Whatever classification the anthropologist makes of man, he never includes mental characteristics as part of those classifications. It is now generally recognized that intelligence tests do not in themselves enable us to differentiate safely between what is due to innate capacity and what is the result of environmental influences, training and education. Whenever it has been possible to make allowances for differences in environmental opportunities, the tests have shown essential similarity in mental characters among all human groups. In short, given similar degrees of cultural opportunity to realize their potentialities, the average achievement of the members of each ethnic group is about the same. The scientific investigations of recent years fully support the dictum of Confucius (551-478 B.C.): 'Men's natures are alike; it is their habits that carry them far apart.'

10. The scientific material available to us at present does not justify the conclusion that inherited genetic differences are a major factor in producing the differences between the cultures and cultural achievements of differ-

ent peoples or groups. It does indicate, however, that the history of the cultural experience which each group has undergone is the major factor in explaining such differences. The one trait which above all others has been at a premium in the evolution of men's mental characters has been educability, plasticity. This is a trait which all human beings possess. It is indeed, a species character of *Homo sapiens.*

11. So far as temperament is concerned, there is no definite evidence that there exist inborn differences between human groups. There is evidence that whatever group differences of the kind there might be are greatly over-ridden by the individual differences, and by the differences springing from environmental factors.

12. As for personality and character, these may be considered raceless. In every human group a rich variety of personality and character types will be found, and there is no reason for believing that any human group is richer than any other in these respects.

13. With respect to race-mixture, the evidence points unequivocally to the fact that this has been going on from the earliest times. Indeed, one of the chief processes of race-information and race-extinction or absorption is by means of hybridization between races or ethnic groups. Furthermore, no convincing evidence has been adduced that race-mixture of itself produces biologically bad effects. Statements that human hybrids frequently show undesirable traits, both physically and mentally, physical disharmonies and mental degeneracies, are not supported by the facts. There is, therefore, no 'biological' justification for prohibiting intermarriage between persons of different ethnic groups.

14. The biological fact of race and the myth of 'race' should be distinguished. For all practical social purposes 'race' is not so much a biological phenomenon as a social myth. The myth 'race' has created an enormous amount of human and social damage. In recent years it has taken a heavy toll in human lives and caused untold suffering. It still prevents the normal development of millions of human beings and deprives civilization of the effective co-operation of productive minds. The biological differences between ethnic groups should be disregarded from

the standpoint of social acceptance and social action. The unity of mankind from both the biological and social viewpoints is the main thing. To recognize this and to act accordingly is the first requirement of modern man. It is but to recognize what a great biologist wrote in 1875: 'As man advances in civilization, and small tribes are united into larger communities, the simplest reason would tell each individual that he ought to extend his social instincts and sympathies to all the members of the same nation, though personally unknown to him. This point being once reached, there is only an artificial barrier to prevent his sympathies extending to the men of all nations and races.' These are the words of Charles Darwin in *The Descent of Man* (2nd ed., 1875, pp. 187-88). And, indeed, the whole of human history shows that a co-operative spirit is not only natural to men, but more deeply rooted than any self-seeking tendencies. If this were not so we should not see the growth of integration and organization of his communities which the centuries and the millenia plainly exhibit.

15. We now have to consider the bearing of these statements on the problem of human equality. It must be asserted with the utmost emphasis that equality as an ethical principle in no way depends upon the assertion that human beings are in fact equal in endowment. Obviously individuals in all ethnic groups vary greatly among themselves in endowment. Nevertheless, the characteristics in which human groups differ from one another are often exaggerated and used as a basis for questioning the validity of equality in the ethical sense. For this purpose we have thought it worth while to set out in a formal manner what is at present scientifically established concerning individual and group differences.

(a) In matters of race, the only characteristics which anthropologists can effectively use as a basis for classifications are physical and physiological.

(b) According to present knowledge there is no proof that the groups of mankind differ in their innate mental characteristics, whether in respect of intelligence or temperament. The scientific evidence indicates that the range of mental capacities in all ethnic groups is much the same.

(c) Historical and sociological studies support the view that genetic differences are not of importance in determining the social and cultural differences between different groups of *Homo sapiens,* and that the social and cultural *changes* in different groups have, in the main, been independent of *changes* in inborn constitution. Vast social changes have occurred which were not in any way connected with changes in racial type.

(d) There is no evidence that race-mixture as such produces bad results from the biological point of view. The social results of race-mixture whether for good or ill are to be traced to social factors.

(e) All normal human beings are capable of learning to share in a common life, to understand the nature of mutual service and reciprocity, and to respect social obligations and contracts. Such biological differences as exist between members of different ethnic groups have no relevance to problems of social and political organization, moral life and communication between human beings.

Lastly, biological studies lend support to the ethic of universal brotherhood; for man is born with drives toward co-operation, and unless these drives are satisfied, men and nations alike fall ill. Man is born a social being who can reach his fullest development only through interaction with his fellows. The denial at any point of this social bond between man and man brings with it disintegration. In this sense, every man is his brother's keeper. For every man is a piece of the continent, a part of the main, because he is involved in mankind.

— Reading No. 32 —

THE UNESCO STATEMENT OF 1951 ON THE NATURE OF RACE AND RACE DIFFERENCES*

Because of the scanty representation of the biological sciences on the committee of 1950 to study the race question, UNESCO, on June 8, 1951, issued a text drafted by physical anthropologists and geneticists on the nature of race and race differences. Following is the full text of the 1951 Statement.

1. Scientists are generally agreed that all men living today belong to a single species, *Homo sapiens,* and are derived from a common stock, even though there is some dispute as to when and how different human groups diverged from this common stock.

The concept of race is unanimously regarded by anthropologists as a classificatory device providing a zoological frame within which the various groups of mankind may be arranged and by means of which studies of evolutionary processes can be facilitated. In its anthropological sense, the word 'race' should be reserved for groups of mankind possessing well-developed and primarily heritable physical differences from other groups. Many populations can be so classified but, because of the complexity of human history, there are also many populations which cannot easily be fitted into a racial classification.

* United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, *The Race Concept: Results of an Inquiry* (Paris, 1951), pp. 12-16. Courtesy of UNESCO, Paris.

2. Some of the physical differences between human groups are due to differences in hereditary constitution and some to differences in the environments in which they have been brought up. In most cases, both influences have been at work. The science of genetics suggests that the hereditary differences among populations of a single species are the results of the action of two sets of processes. On the one hand, the genetic composition of isolated populations is constantly but gradually being altered by natural selection and by occasional changes (mutations) in the material particles (genes) which control heredity. Populations are also affected by fortuitous changes in gene frequency and by marriage customs. On the other hand, crossing is constantly breaking down the differentiations so set up. The new mixed populations, in so far as they, in turn, become isolated, are subject to the same processes, and these may lead to further changes. Existing races are merely the result, considered at a particular moment in time, of the total effect of such processes on the human species. The hereditary characters to be used in the classification of human groups, the limits of their variation within these groups, and thus the extent of the classificatory subdivisions adopted may legitimately differ according to the scientific purpose in view.

3. National, religious, geographical, linguistic and cultural groups do not necessarily coincide with racial groups; and the cultural traits of such groups have no demonstrated connexion with racial traits. Americans are not a race, nor are Frenchmen, nor Germans; nor *ipso facto* is any other national group. Moslems and Jews are no more races than are Roman Catholics and Protestants; nor are people who live in Iceland or Britain or India, or who speak English or any other language, or who are culturally Turkish or Chinese and the like, thereby describable as races. The use of the term 'race' in speaking of such groups may be a serious error, but it is one which is habitually committed.

4. Human races can be, and have been, classified in different ways by different anthropologists. Most of them agree in classifying the greater part of existing mankind into at least three large units, which may be called major

groups (in French *grand-races,* in German *Hauptrassen*). Such a classification does not depend on any single physical character, nor does, for example, skin colour by itself necessarily distinguish one major group from another. Furthermore, so far as it has been possible to analyse them, the differences in physical structure which distinguish one major group from another give no support to popular notions of any general 'superiority' or 'inferiority' which are sometimes implied in referring to these groups.

Broadly speaking, individuals belonging to different major groups of mankind are distinguishable by virtue of their physical characters, but individual members, or small groups, belonging to different races within the same major group are usually not so distinguishable. Even the major groups grade into each other, and the physical traits by which they and the races within them are characterized overlap considerably. With respect to most, if not all, measurable characters, the differences among individuals belonging to the same race are greater than the differences that occur between the observed averages for two or more races within the same major group.

5. Most anthropologists do not include mental characteristics in their classification of human races. Studies within a single race have shown that both innate capacity and environmental opportunity determine the results of tests of intelligence and temperament, though their relative importance is disputed.

When intelligence tests, even non-verbal, are made on a group of non-literate people, their scores are usually lower than those of more civilized people. It has been recorded that different groups of the same race occupying similarly high levels of civilization may yield considerable differences in intelligence tests. When, however, the two groups have been brought up from childhood in similar environments, the differences are usually very slight. Moreover, there is good evidence that, given similar opportunities, the average performance (that is to say, the performance of the individual who is representative because he is surpassed by as many as he surpasses), and the variation round it, do not differ appreciably from one race to another.

Even those psychologists who claim to have found the

greatest differences in intelligence between groups of different racial origin, and have contended that they are hereditary, always report that some members of the group of inferior performance surpass not merely the lowest ranking member of the superior group, but also the average of its members. In any case, it has never been possible to separate members of two groups on the basis of mental capacity, as they can often be separated on a basis of religion, skin colour, hair form or language. It is possible, though not proved, that some types of innate capacity for intellectual and emotional responses are commoner in one human group than in another, but it is certain that, within a single group, innate capacities vary as much as, if not more than, they do between different groups.

The study of the heredity of psychological characteristics is beset with difficulties. We know that certain mental diseases and defects are transmitted from one generation to the next, but we are less familiar with the part played by heredity in the mental life of normal individuals. The normal individual, irrespective of race, is essentially educable. It follows that his intellectual and moral life is largely conditioned by his training and by his physical and social environment.

It often happens that a national group may appear to be characterized by particular psychological attributes. The superficial view would be that this is due to race. Scientifically, however, we realize that any common psychological attribute is more likely to be due to a common historical and social background, and that such attributes may obscure the fact that, within different populations consisting of many human types, one will find approximately the same range of temperament and intelligence.

6. The scientific material available to us at present does not justify the conclusion that inherited genetic differences are a major factor in producing the differences between the cultures and cultural achievements of different peoples or groups. It does indicate, on the contrary, that a major factor is explaining such differences in the cultural experience which each group has undergone.

7. There is no evidence for the existence of so-called 'pure' races. Skeletal remains provide the basis of our limited knowledge about earlier races. In regard to race

mixture, the evidence points to the fact that human hybridization has been going on for an indefinite but considerable time. Indeed, one of the processes of race formation and race extinction or absorption is by means of hybridization between races. As there is no reliable evidence that disadvantageous effects are produced thereby, no biological justification exists for prohibiting intermarriage between persons of different races.

8. We now have to consider the bearing of these statements on the problem of human equality. We wish to emphasize that equality of opportunity and equality in law in no way depend, as ethical principles, upon the assertion that human beings are in fact equal in endowment.

9. We have thought it worth while to set out in a formal manner what is at present scientifically established concerning individual and group differences.

(a) In matters of race, the only characteristics which anthropologists have so far been able to use effectively as a basis for classification are physical (anatomical and physiological).

(b) Available scientific knowledge provides no basis for believing that the groups of mankind differ in their innate capacity for intellectual and emotional development.

(c) Some biological differences between human beings within a single race may be as great as, or greater than, the same biological differences between races.

(d) Vast social changes have occurred that have not been connected in any way with changes in racial type. Historical and sociological studies thus support the view that genetic differences are of little significance in determining the social and cultural differences between different groups of men.

(e) There is no evidence that race mixture produces disadvantageous results from a biological point of view. The social results of race mixture, whether for good or ill, can generally be traced to social factors.

— Reading No. 33 —

BROWN v. BOARD OF EDUCATION OF TOPEKA: U. S. SUPREME COURT DECISION ON SEGREGATION IN EDUCATION, 1954*

In 1954 the U.S. Supreme Court reversed Plessy v. Ferguson (1896), with its "separate but equal" doctrine. In the Brown case the Court directed the lower courts to admit Negroes to public schools on a non-segregated basis "with all deliberate speed." Following is from the concluding part of this decision.

In approaching this problem, we cannot turn the clock back to 1868 when the Amendment was adopted, or even to 1896 when Plessy v. Ferguson was written. We must consider public education in the light of its full development and its present place in American life throughout the Nation. Only in this way can it be determined if segregation in public schools deprives these plaintiffs of the equal protection of the laws.

Today, education is perhaps the most important function of state and local government. Compulsory school attendance laws and the great expenditures for education both demonstrate our recognition of the importance of education to our democratic society. It is required in the performance of our most basic public responsibilities, even service in the armed forces. It is the very foundation

* 347 U.S. 483 (1954).

of good citizenship. Today it is a principal instrument in awakening the child to cultural values, in preparing him for later professional training, and in helping him to adjust normally to his environment. In these days, it is doubtful that any child may reasonably be expected to succeed in life if he is denied the opportunity of an education. Such an opportunity, where the state has undertaken to provide it, is a right which must be made available to all on equal terms. . . .

We conclude that in the field of public education the doctrine of "separate but equal" has no place. Separate educational facilities are inherently unequal. Therefore, we hold that the plaintiffs and others similarly situated for whom the actions have been brought are, by reason of the segregation complained of, deprived of the equal protection of the laws guaranteed by the Fourteenth Amendment. This disposition makes unnecessary any discussion whether such segregation also violates the Due Process Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment.

— Reading No. 34 —

ALBERT JOHN LUTHULI: DENUNCIATION OF THE CULT OF WHITE RACE SUPREMACY, 1961*

On December 11, 1961, the Nobel Peace Prize for 1960 was awarded to 62-year-old Albert John Luthuli, a former Zulu chief living in South Africa. In his speech of acceptance at Oslo, Luthuli denounced the government of

* *The New York Times,* December 12, 1961.

South Africa and its policy of apartheid *as "a hangover from the dark past of mankind." Following are portions of Luthuli's speech.*

✓ ✓ ✓

It is not necessary for me to speak at length about South Africa. It is a museum piece in our time, a hangover from the dark past of mankind, a relic of an age which everywhere else is dead or dying.

Here the cult of race superiority and of white supremacy is worshiped like a god. The ghost of slavery lingers on to this day in the form of forced labor that goes on in what are called farm prisons. . . .

The true patriots of South Africa, for whom I speak, will be satisfied with nothing less than the fullest democratic rights.

In government we will not be satisfied with anything less than direct individual adult suffrage and the right to stand for and be elected to all organs of government.

In economic matters we will be satisfied with nothing less than equality of opportunity in every sphere, and the enjoyment by all of those heritages which form the resources of the country which up to now have been appropriated on a racial "whites only" basis.

In culture we will be satisfied with nothing less than the opening of all doors of learning in non-segregatory institutions on the sole criterion of ability.

In the social sphere we will be satisfied with nothing less than the abolition of all racial bars.

We do not demand these things for people of African descent alone. We demand them for all South Africans, white and black.

In a strife-torn world, tottering on the brink of complete destruction by man-made nuclear weapons, a free and independent Africa is in the making, in answer to the injunction and challenge of history:

"Arise and shine, for thy light is come."

RECOMMENDED READING

Allport, G. W., *The Nature of Prejudice* (Cambridge, Mass., 1954).

Barzun, J., *Race, A Study in Modern Superstition* (New York, 1937).

Benedict, R., *Patterns of Culture* (New York, 1934).

———, *Race, Science, and Politics* (New York, [illegible]).

Boas, F., *Racial Purity, Asia* (XL), 1940.

Boyd, W. C., *Genetics and the Races of Man* ([illegible]).

Congar, Yves M.-J., *The Catholic Church and the Race Question* (Paris, 1953).

Coons, C. S., *The Races of Europe* (New York, 1939).

Coudenhove-Kalergi, H., *Anti-Semitism through the Ages* (London, 1935).

Count, E. W., ed., *This Is Race* (New York, [illegible]).

Cox, O. C., *Caste, Class, and Race* (New York, [illegible]).

Dixon, R. B., *The Racial History of Man* (New York, 1923).

Dobzhansky, T., *Evolution, Genetics and Man* (New York and London, 1951).

Frazier, E. F., *The Negro in America* ([illegible]).

Gallagher, B. G., *Color and Conscience* ([illegible] 1946).

Haldane, J. B. S., *Heredity and Politics* ([illegible]).

Hankins, F. H., *The Racial Basis of* [illegible] (New York, 1926).

Hellman, E., ed., *Handbook on Racial* [illegible], 1949).

Herskovits, M. J., *Man and His Works* ([illegible]).

Hooft, W. A. V. 'T., *The Ecumenical* [illegible] *Racial Problem* (Paris, 1954).

Hooton, E. A., *Up From the Ape* (New [illegible]

Howells, W. W., *Mankind So Far* (New [illegible]

Huxley, J. C., and Haddon, A. C., *We* [illegible] *of "Racial Problems"* (New York [illegible]

Kroeber, A. L., *Anthropology* (New York, [illegible]

Linton, R., *The Study of Man* (New [illegible], 1936).

Logan, R. W., *The Negro in the United* [illegible] 1957).

Malalasekera and Jayatilleke, K. N., [illegible] *Question* (Paris, 1958).

Montagu, M. F., Ashley, *Man's Most Dangerous Myth: The Fallacy of Race* (New York, 1946).
Myrdal, G., *An American Dilemma: The Negro Problem and Modern Democracy* (New York, 1944).
Reuter, E.B., *Race and Culture Contacts* (New York, 1934).
Roth, L., *Jewish Thought as a Factor in Civilization* (Paris, 1954).
Shapiro, H. L., *The Heritage of the* Bounty (New York, 1936).
Snyder, L. L., *Race: A History of Modern Ethnic Theories* (New York and London, 1939).
Stanton, W., *The Leopard's Spots, Scientific Attitudes toward Race in America, 1815-59* (Chicago, 1960).
United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO), *The Race Question in Modern Science* (New York, 1956).
Young, D. R., *American Minority Peoples* (New York, 1932).

INDEX